Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 87-578
H. R. 10802

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 10802 1
Digest of Public Law 87-578 2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 10802

Mar. 16, 1962	House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 10802, which includes items for the Forest Service. H. Report No. 1446. Print of bill and report.
Mar. 20, 1962	House passed H. R. 10802 without amendment.
Mar. 21, 1962	H. R. 10802 was referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee. Print of bill as referred.
May 1, 1962	Senate subcommittee approved H. R. 10802.
May 10, 1962	Senate committee reported H. R. 10802 with amendments. S. Report No. 1490. Print of bill and report.
May 17, 1962	Senate passed over H. R. 10802.
June 6, 1962	Sen. Williams, Del., submitted a proposed amendment.
June 8, 1962	H. R. 10802 was made the Senate's unfinished business.
June 11, 1962	Senate began debate on H. R. 10802,
June 12, 1962	Senate passed H. R. 10802 with amendments.
	Senate conferees were appointed.
	Print of bill as passed by Senate.
July 26, 1962	House conferees were appointed on H. R. 10802.
July 27, 1962	House received conference report on H. R. 10802. H. Report No. 2049. Print of report.
July 30, 1962	House agreed to conference report.
Aug. 1, 1962	Senate agreed to conference report.
Aug. 9, 1962	Approved: Public Law 87-578.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 87-578

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1963 . Provides funds for the Department of Interior and related agencies, including the Forest Service.

FOREST SERVICE: This Act provides annual appropriations of $223,295,000, an increase of $14,526,000 over fiscal year 1962 excluding the 1962 supplemental appropriation of $34,500,000 for fighting forest fires. Permanent appropriations are also available in the estimated amount of $47,946,932.

Items of major significance contained in P.L. 87-578 for the Forest Service, including changes over 1962, are as follows: Forest protection and utilization $180,065,000 appropriated (net increase of $10,256,000 as follows: $11,759,000 increase for forest land management, $1,112,000 increase for forest research, $2,645,000 decrease in forest research construction, and $30,000 increase for forestry work in the Virgin Islands.) The Act provides that of the $139,400,000 appropriated for forest land management, $5,000,000 shall constitute a contingency fund for use only to the extent necessary to meet emergency forest fire situations, and $1,910,000 shall be used only to the extent necessary for control activities under the Forest Pest Control Act. Forest roads and trails -- $37,500,000 appropriated for the liquidation of contracts under the Federal Highway Act; Access roads -- $2,000,000 appropriated; Acquisition of lands for national forests -- $2,000,000 appropriated for Superior National Forest, and $30,000 under Special Acts; Cooperative range improvements -- $700,000 appropriated; Assistance to States for tree planting -- $1,000,000 appropriated.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued March 19, 1962
For actions of March 16, 1962
87th-2d, No. 39

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....11
Appropriations.....1,2
Consumers.....6
Cooperatives.....5
Dairy industry.....4
Federal Trade Commission.9
Foreign trade.....8
Forest Service appropriations.....1
Imports.....13
Interior appropriations..1
Lands.....16
Pay.....10
Personnel.....10
Saline water research....1
Soil bank.....7
Sugar.....3
Transportation.....15
Virgin Islands.....1
Water pollution.....12
Wildlife.....14

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported Interior appropriation bill (includes Forest Service). Sen. Bennett criticized proposal to reduce domestic sugar allotments. Senate committee reported Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. The Appropriations Committee reported (during adjournment of the House) this bill, H. R. 10802 (H. Rept. 1446), which includes items for the Forest Service as shown in the table at the end of this Digest. Excerpts from the Committee report are also attached. The bill also includes items for saline water research and Virgin Islands Corporation.

SENATE

2. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 10526, the Treasury-Post Office and Executive Office appropriation bill for 1963 (S. Rept. 1307). p. 3976

3. SUGAR. Sen. Bennett urged early consideration of sugar legislation, criticized "the administration's current proposal contained in a tentative nine-point program presented for discussion to a group of sugar industry representatives last week" which "would force a 10-percent reduction in domestic sugarbeet acreage next year," and inserted an outline of the proposal. pp. 4006-8

4. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Sen. Proxmire urged the S. Agriculture and Forestry Committee to report a measure to continue temporarily the current price supports on milk and butterfat and inserted testimony before the committee in support of such a measure. pp. 4021-31

   Sen. Proxmire discussed preliminary results of studies by the University of Dublin and Harvard University indicating that the consumption of dairy products does not cause heart disease. p. 3990

5. COOPERATIVES. Sen. Humphrey defended farmer cooperatives against a "grossly misleading and highly unfair article" in Reader's Digest, "Why Should These Co-ops Enjoy Special Tax Privileges?" pp. 4033-4

6. CONSUMERS. Sen. Proxmire commended the President's message on consumers and urged favorable consideration of his recommendation. p. 3991

7. SOIL BANK. Received from this Department a report on the 1961 soil bank conservation reserve program. p. 3975.

8. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Keating inserted an article on foreign trade supporting his proposal for a congressional veto over foreign trade agreements. pp. 3987-8

   Sen. Mansfield inserted a statement to the President by the public advisers to the U. S. delegation to the recent GATT Tariff Conference in Geneva to refute criticisms of the agreements reached at the Conference. pp. 4032-3

9. FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION. Received the annual report of FTC. p. 3976

10. PERSONNEL; PAY. Received from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures a report on Federal employment and pay for Jan. 1962. pp. 3976-82

11. RECESSED until Mon., Mar. 19. p. 4041

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

12. WATER POLLUTION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Metcalf discussing his bill S. 2767, to require the approval of the Secretary of the Interior to surveys, plans, specifications, and estimates for projects on the Federal-aid highway system for the purpose of protecting fish and wildlife and recreation resources and inserting an article, "Roadbuilding and Fishing." pp. A2036-7

BILLS INTRODUCED

13. IMPORTS. S. 3006, by Sen. Ellender (by request), to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 3982-3

14. WILDLIFE. S. 3007, by Sen. Moss, relating to the conservation of wildlife within Dinosaur National Monument; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

15. TRANSPORTATION. S. 3015, by Sen. Magnuson (by request), to amend the act of March 2, 1929, and the Act of August 27, 1935, relating to load lines for oceangoing and coastwise vessels, to establish liability for surveys, to increase penalties, to permit deeper loading in coastwise trade; to Commerce Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 3983-4

16. LANDS. S. J. Res. 172, by Sen. Dworshak, to provide that, for the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide for the transfers of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.," approved July 11, 1952 (66 Stat. A. 150), the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc., shall be held and considered to have made payment in full to the Secretary of the Interior for such land; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Remarks of author. p. 3984

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Mar. 19: USDA supplemental appropriations for 1962, H. Appropriations (exec)(AMS, ARS, and FS to testify).

Permanent Federal administration of ACP program, H. Agriculture (Ritchie, ASCS, to testify).

Permit raising of flaxseed and payments for seeds raised on diverted acreage, H. Agriculture (Satterfield, ASCS, to testify).

Disaster loans for oyster planters, H. Agriculture (Barnard, FHA, to testify).

Restrictions on transportation of diseased livestock and poultry, H. Agriculture (ARS to testify).

oOo

For supplemental information or copies of legislative material referred to, USDA personnel in Washington may send to Room 117-E or call Ext. 4654.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

House Committee Bill, 1963, Compared with Appropriations, 1962, and Budget Estimates, 1963

Item	Appropriations, 1962 a/	Budget Estimates, 1963	House Committee Bill, 1963	Change, House Committee Bill, 1963 Compared With: Appropriations 1962	Change, House Committee Bill, 1963 Compared With: Budget Estimates, 1963
ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS:					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management b/	$127,641,000	$140,740,000	$138,400,000	+$10,759,000	-$2,340,000
Forest research	26,368,000	23,150,000	22,975,000	-3,393,000	-175,000
State and private forestry cooperation	15,800,000	15,800,000	15,800,000	- -	- -
Total, Forest protection and utilization	169,809,000	179,690,000	177,175,000	+7,366,000	-2,515,000
Forest roads and trails	35,000,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	+2,500,000	- -
Access roads	2,000,000	2,000,000	- -	-2,000,000	-2,000,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Superior National Forest	250,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+1,750,000	- -
Special Acts (Cache National Forest)	10,000	10,000	10,000	- -	- -
Cooperative range improvements	700,000	700,000	700,000	- -	- -
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	- -	- -
Total, Annual Appropriations	208,769,000	222,900,000	218,385,000	+9,616,000	-4,515,000
PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS (Primarily "Payments to States and Territories" and "Roads and Trails for States" payable from national forest receipts c/	44,928,500	50,479,300	50,479,300	-5,550,800	- -

a/ Includes all supplemental appropriations to date.
b/ Includes contingency funds to the extent necessary as follows: (1) For emergency forest fire fighting, $5,000,000; and (2) for insect and disease control, $1,910,000.
c/ In addition, prior year balances available.

EXCERPTS FROM HOUSE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE - FOREST SERVICE

Forest Protection and Utilization

"Forest land management.--.... Because of the depressed timber market, the Committee believes that the Forest Service can readily absorb the reduction of $800,000 and 100 permanent positions applied against the activity, "Sales administration and management." The Committee has granted sizeable increases in this activity in recent years and the $22,380,000 allowed should finance adequately the workload in 1963. The amount allowed includes an additional $400,000 for special small and salvage sales.

"The $300,000 allowed for acquisition of land, a decrease of $200,000 in the budget request, should provide for acquiring essential tracts in fiscal year 1963. It should be noted that the Committee approved an increase in this item from $100,000 to $300,000 in fiscal year 1962.

"In disallowing $300,000 of the requested increase of $1,300,000 for 'Other pest control' work, the Committee believes that the $6,985,000 allowed is all that is warranted without firmer estimates of the infestations to be encountered in the next fiscal year.

"Within the total provided it is expected that the Forest Service will make $30,000 available for continuing the forestry work in the Virgin Islands which has heretofore been financed under the appropriation to the Virgin Islands Corporation."

"Forest research.--.... Due to nonrecurring funds for construction of research facilities in the current year, the amount allowed provides an effective increase of $1,052,000 for expansion of forestry research. The decrease made by the Committee reflects a general reduction in the funds requested for travel, supplies, materials, and equipment."

Access Roads

"The committee has deleted the budget request of $2,000,000 to continue this special appropriation item for acquiring by purchase private roads needed to provide access to national forest areas. Funds have been appropriated under this item for the past three fiscal years as it was assumed that the Forest Service did not have authority under the regular Forest roads and trails appropriation to require cost sharing charges of benefiting private land owners. As the Comptroller General ruled on March 2, 1962, that the regular Forest roads and trails appropriation is available for this purpose, the Committee believes the continuation of this item is no longer warranged and that financing of the road program should hereafter be restricted to the authorization contained in the Federal Highway Act."

Acquisition of Land for National Forests

Superior National Forest

"The Committee has approved the budget request of $2,000,000 to complete the acquisition of lands in the wilderness canoe area in the Superior National Forest. .... The Committee expects that the Forest Service will complete the program within the appropriation provided."

PERSONNEL

"The Committee ... directs that each agency head make a concerted effort to carry out the programs in fiscal year 1963 with a minimum of personnel increase. The Committee will expect agency heads in the presentation of the 1964 estimates to provide a full report on the results of their review of personnel requirements and the progress that has been made in providing a more effective utilization of personnel. The Committee feels that if satisfactory progress is not made in materially reducing personnel requirements that it may be necessary to resort to personnel limitations in future appropriation bills."

OTHER OBJECTS OF EXPENDITURE

"The Committee has ... where appropriate, applied a general reduction of about five percent in the amounts requested for travel, supplies, materials, and equipment and expects that all agencies will take immediate steps to review policies and procedures governing expenditures for these purposes and to take concerted action to assure that every effort is made by personnel to secure significant savings. The Committee plans to review progress made in this regard and, if effective action is not taken by the agencies, may find it necessary in the next appropriation bill to place limitations on these expenditures."

87TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 1446

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

MARCH 16, 1962.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 10802]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year 1963. The bill provides regular annual appropriations for the Department of the Interior (except Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration) and for other related agencies including the U.S. Forest Service.

SUMMARY OF BILL

Appropriations, 1962 (to date)		$795, 791, 650
Budget Estimates, 1963		930, 674, 000
Recommended in Bill, 1963		868, 595, 000
Bill compared with:		
Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	(+9%)	+72, 803, 350
Budget Estimates, 1963	(−7%)	−62, 079, 000

REVENUES

The activities covered by the Bill are forecasted to generate $622,800,000 in Federal revenues in fiscal year 1963 compared with $522,100,000 in 1962, or an increase of $100,700,000.

Increased Program Costs

The Committee is concerned with the large additional requests received each year for funds to finance the activities covered by the bill. It has again made every effort to effect savings wherever possible and yet make adequate provision for the many essential additional requirements that must be provided for if we are to preserve and develop our great natural resources, including the National forests and parks, fish and wildlife, public lands and minerals, and make adequate provision for the education and care of the American Indians and their resources.

It should be noted that of the amounts provided in the bill, over $36,000,000 is required just to implement recent laws passed by the Congress which over the years will require increases of many additional millions of dollars.

The extent of the activities funded in this Bill is indicated by the following summary:

1. Conservation and administration of 477 million acres of public domain land involving forest, range, mineral and water resources.

2. Provision of educational assistance, facilities, and services to over 53,000 Indian children in Federal day and boarding schools and assistance to over 45,000 Indian children in the Public Schools; welfare and guidance services to 17,000 needy Indians; management and protection of nearly 50 million acres of Indian-owned forest and range lands; construction, operation and maintenance of 300 irrigation systems serving about 864,000 acres; and maintenance of over 16,000 miles of roads on Indian reservations.

3. Management, protection, maintenance, and construction of facilities, including 16,000 miles of roads and trails, in 192 National Parks and other areas comprising about 25½ million acres with an estimated 81 million visitors in 1963.

4. Provision under the Geological Survey for topographic surveys and mapping of the United States, of which only about 60 percent of the land area has been mapped; geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping; water resources investigations; and supervision of 234,000 properties leased for oil, gas, and other minerals valued at $1.33 billion.

5. Conservation, evaluation, and development of our mineral resources under the Bureau of Mines, including inspection of 9,000 coal mines and the production, conservation and sale of the Nation's helium;

6. The conduct of research, management, and demonstration programs to conserve and restore fish and wildlife resources for both recreational and commercial use, including the operation and maintenance of 97 fish hatcheries and 284 National wildlife refuges consisting of more than 28.5 million acres;

7. The management, protection, and development of 186 million acres of land in the National Forests, including an estimated sale of 9.7 billion board-feet of timber in 1963 with a value of $121 million; provision of recreation facilities for an estimated 115 million visitors; grazing for 6 million livestock; and cooperation with States in fire control, tree planting, and forest management and processing.

Personnel

The budget estimates proposed a total of 60,767 permanent positions for the agencies funded in the bill, an increase of 4,421 over the current fiscal year. Although the Committee appreciates that additional requirements necessitate some increase in personnel, it does not believe that every effort is being made to secure maximum productivity from existing personnel and to shift individuals from work of lower priority to implement new or expanded essential activities. The Committee has made a specific reduction of 1,230 permanent positions or 28 percent, and directs that each agency head make a concerted effort to carry out the programs in fiscal year 1963 with a minimum of personnel increase. The Committee will expect agency heads in the presentation of the 1964 estimates to provide a full report on the results of their review of personnel requirements and the progress that has been made in providing a more effective utilization of personnel. The Committee feels that if satisfactory progress is not made in materially reducing personnel requirements that it may be necessary to resort to personnel limitations in future appropriation bills.

Other Objects of Expenditure

The Committee expressed its concern last year over the increased cost of other objects of expenditure and stated that it expected the agencies would exercise more strict control over the use of such funds in the future. Emphasis in recent years on performance and activity budgeting has resulted in a lack of proper vigilance and cost consciousness by management and supervisory personnel in the manner in which funds are expended for travel, supplies, materials, and equipment. The 1963 budget estimates for these objects for the Department of the Interior agencies covered by the bill reflect a 50 percent increase over the actual obligations for fiscal year 1961.

The Committee believes that the exercise of stricter controls over such expenditures would result in significant economies without diminishing the effectiveness of carrying out the required programs. The Committee has, therefore, where appropriate, applied a general reduction of about five percent in the amounts requested for travel, supplies, materials, and equipment and expects that all agencies will take immediate steps to review policies and procedures governing expenditures for these purposes and to take concerted action to assure that every effort is made by personnel to secure significant savings. The Committee plans to review progress made in this regard and, if effective action is not taken by the agencies, may find it necessary in the next appropriation bill to place limitations on these expenditures.

Employee Housing

The Committee is continuing in fiscal year 1963 its policy of limiting the unit cost of employee housing in the United States, excluding Alaska, to $20,000. The limitation includes engineering and design costs, but excludes provision of utilities to the lot line. Any exceptions to this monetary limitation shall continue to be submitted to the Committee for its advance review and approval. Employee houses shall not exceed the standards outlined by the Committee in its Report No. 233, 87th Congress, 1st Session.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $39,375,000, a decrease of $2,177,000 in the budget estimate and an increase of $5,625,000 in the current year's appropriation. The amounts allowed by the Committee by activity compared with the 1962 appropriation and the 1963 budget estimate are as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1963	Bill compared with—	
		1962 appropriation	Estimate, 1963
Lease and disposal of land and mineral resources	$10,200,000	+$1,207,254	−$635,000
Management of grazing lands	5,300,000	+1,264,348	−300,000
Forestry	8,300,000	+1,197,949	−500,000
Cadastral surveys	4,225,000	+549,600	−265,000
Soil and moisture conservation	8,525,000	+2,111,470	
Fire suppression	400,000		
Maintenance of physical facilities and access roads	203,000		
Weed control	909,000		
General administration	1,690,000	−50,750	−100,000
Committee reduction in travel, supplies and materials, and equipment	−377,000	−377,000	−377,000
Transfers in the estimates		−277,871	
Total	39,375,000	+5,625,000	−2,177,000

The reduction of $100,000 in "General administration," is due to the nonrecurring item provided for the current year for purchase of accounting equipment. The Committee reductions reflect a disallowance of 223 of the 498 additional permanent positions requested in the estimates.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee has allowed the budget request of $1,000,000 for construction of timber access roads on the public domain and Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands and for construction of buildings and facilities primarily in connection with fire control measures in Alaska. The amount allowed represents a decrease of $149,006 in the amount available for the current year due to the availability of carryover balances in 1962.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

The bill continues, as proposed in the budget, the indefinite appropriation of twenty-five percent of the gross receipts from sales of timber and other products, representing one-third of the revenues due the Oregon and California counties, for construction and maintenance of timber access roads and reforestation and improvements on the Oregon and California Railroad grant lands. It is estimated that $7,750,000 will be available for these purposes from timber receipts in 1963, compared with a total available in 1962 of $9,572,214, including carryover balances.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

The Committee recommends $81,000,000, an increase of $9,250,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $1,827,000 in the budget request.

The amounts allowed by the Committee by activity compared with the 1962 appropriation and the estimate for 1963 are as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1963	Bill compared with—	
		1962 appropriation	Estimate, 1963
Assistance to Indian pupils in non-Federal schools	$7,954,000	+$1,100,000	
Expenses of educating Indian children in Federal facilities	53,380,600	+6,532,884	−$600,000
Adult education and vocational training program	6,434,400	+1,560,545	
Welfare and guidance services	9,348,000	+968,874	
Relocation services	2,815,000		
Maintaining law and order	1,970,000	+321,000	−325,000
Committee reduction in travel, supplies, and materials and equipment	−902,000	−902,000	−902,000
Transfers in the estimates		−331,303	
Total	81,000,000	+9,250,000	−1,827,000

Due to delay anticipated in the construction of new school facilities and with appropriate economies in operations, the Committee believes the reduction of $600,000 and 100 positions can readily be effected in the activity "Expenses of educating Indian children in Federal facilities."

In allowing the increase of only $321,000 and 47 positions for the activity "Maintaining law and order," the Committee feels that the Indian tribes should be encouraged to maintain this responsibility to the greatest extent possible.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $34,300,000, an increase of $5,225,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $117,000 in the budget estimate.

The amounts allowed by the Committee by activity compared with the 1962 appropriation and the 1963 budget estimates are as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1963	Compared with—	
		1962 appropriation	Estimate, 1963
Forest and range lands	$4,300,000	+$789,753	
Fire suppression	140,000		
Agricultural and industrial assistance	5,395,000	+2,212,041	
Soil and moisture conservation	5,612,000	+445,308	+$260,000
Maintenance of roads	2,850,000	+500	
Development of Indian arts and crafts	300,000	+97,800	
Management of Indian trust property	5,268,000	+629,952	
Repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities	9,562,000	+1,029,308	
Operation, repair and maintenance of Indian irrigation system	1,250,000	+162,200	
Committee reduction in travel, supplies and materials and equipment	−377,000	−377,000	−377,000
Net transfers in the estimate		+235,138	
Total	34,300,000	+5,225,000	−117,000

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

The Committee recommends $4,000,000, the budget estimate and the same as 1962, for loans to Indians and Indian organizations to promote their economic development. A total of $27,000,000 has been authorized for the fund, of which $10,000,000 was authorized by Public Law 87–250, approved September 15, 1961. A total of $17,799,600 of the amount authorized has been appropriated to date.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee has allowed $52,000,000 for construction of Indian schools, dormitories, quarters, utilities, and other buildings and irrigation systems, an increase of $12,439,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $2,765,000 in the budget request. It is estimated that with the present backlog and the projected increase in school population for 1963 that there will be a total of over 7,500 additional Indian pupils requiring seats by September, 1963. The amount allowed will provide school facilities for about 4,000 additional students leaving an estimated out of school backlog of about 3,500 to be provided for in subsequent years. The appropriation will also provide for replacement of about 3,600 seats in some of the most hazardous, unsafe and substandard buildings in the existing Bureau school plants. The amount provided includes $785,000 for construction of the Laguna Consolidated School in New Mexico. Considering the unobligated balance of over $21,000,000 under this item as of February 1, 1962, it is believed that the reduction recommended of $2,765,000, or five percent, will readily be absorbed through slippage in the 1963 construction program. The Committee expects that the Bureau will continue to utilize standard plans and specifications and that every effort will be made to hold down construction costs.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The Committee recommends $16,000,000, the same as the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $1,000,000 in the budget request, to liquidate in fiscal year 1963 the obligations incurred under the contract authorization for Federal-Aid Highway roads and the Navajo-Hopi roads. Because of slippage in this program during the current fiscal year, the amount provided will meet adequately cash requirements during the next fiscal year. As of February 1, 1962, the Bureau had obligated only $6,070,000 of the $17,518,000 available during the current year, and had an unexpended balance of $8,365,000.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $4,000,000, an increase of $33,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $372,000 in the budget estimate. On an available funds basis, the amount allowed is an increase of $78,172 due to transfers in the estimates of $45,172 to the General Services Administration. The amount allowed includes $25,000 for Boards of U.S. civil service examiners and $53,172 for the employee training program. The

Committee has also disallowed $100,000 of the proposed increase of $371,500 in the amount budgeted for transfer from program funds for administrative expenses. The transfer allowed of $2,900,000, together with the direct appropriation of $4,000,000, should be adequate for these requirements during fiscal year 1963. The amount allowed reflects a reduction of fifty permanent positions from the budget request.

National Park Service

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $25,425,000, an increase of $3,613,500 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $1,815,000 in the budget estimates. The increases allowed include: $195,000 for management of new areas including $15,000 for the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Indiana; $1,225,669 for operation of newly constructed facilities; $1,114,718 for operating costs brought about by increased visitor use and extension of the operating season; $177,061 for additional ranger services and interpretive functions in the Washington and regional offices; $150,000 for fifteen additional U.S. Park Police; $96,375 to finance under this appropriation certain positions now financed from land acquisition funds; $103,450 for expansion of water resources studies; $160,800 for the archeological investigations and salvage program; $12,470 for the concessions management and audit staff; $182,300 for the employee training program; $127,700 for leasing additional communication facilities and conversion of existing park radio systems; and $251,114 for information publications, employees compensation fund payments, an additional mobile tree crew, and for soil and moisture conservation.

The net reduction by the Committee of $1,815,000 includes: an increase of $15,000 for the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial and disallowance of $98,015 of the increase requested of $195,356 for expansion of ranger services functions in the Washington and regional offices; $330,000 of the increase of $480,000 requested for the U.S. Park Police; $300,000 to initiate a comprehensive history and natural history investigation program; $815,680 for recreation planning; and $131,305 to expand the Historic American buildings and sites Surveys. In addition, the Committee has imposed a general reduction of $155,000 in the overall request for travel, supplies and materials, and equipment. The reductions imposed by the Committee reflect a disallowance of 147 of the additional permanent positions proposed in the budget estimate.

As the President in his February 28, 1962, message on conservation stated that the recommendation of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to create within the Department of Interior a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation is to be adopted to carry out the planning functions already assigned to the Department of Interior and to administer the program of Federal assistance for State agencies, the Committee has deleted, as indicated above, the proposed increase of $815,680 for recreation planning. Continuation of the present appropriation level of $1,609,320 will provide adequate funds pending creation of the new bureau. At that time the Committee will expect that the amounts provided in the bill for Nation-wide recreation planning, $504,337 and for cooperation with States and other agencies, $596,759, will be transferred to the new bureau.

The Committee does not believe that the proposed move of the regional office of the National Park Service from Omaha, Nebraska, to Cheyenne, Wyoming, is warranted, and has disapproved the use of any funds for this purpose.

With the ever mounting fund requirements to construct, maintain, and manage facilities required in our National Parks, the Committee is concerned at the failure of the National Park Service to take appropriate steps to increase revenues. With 78 million visitors to the National Parks in 1961, revenues received by the National Park Service amounted to only $5,660,000 or less than 7 cents per visitor. $4.8 million of these receipts were from automobile, admission, guide and other fees and only $520,000 was from business concessions. Considering that these concessions had a gross income during this period of about $48 million, the Committee believes that considerable increase in franchise fees is warranted. It is therefore requesting that the National Park Service study this question and report to the Committee next year on appropriate steps to be taken to materially increase the revenues collected by the Federal Government.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

The Committee has allowed the budget request of $20,000,000, an increase of $2,131,000 in the 1962 appropriation, for operation, maintenance and rehabilitation of roads and trails and buildings, utilities and other facilities in the National Parks. The increase allowed includes $160,000 for new parks; $367,000 for wage rate increases; $1,164,300 for maintenance and operation of new and reconstructed facilities; and $439,700 for more adequate maintenance and operation of other facilities. The amount provided includes $10,000 to initiate maintenance work at the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Indiana.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $40,000,000, an increase of $3,274,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $4,000,000 and 40 positions in the 1963 budget request. The amount provided by activity compared with 1962 appropriation and the 1963 estimate is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill	Bill compared with—	
		1962 appropriation	Estimate, 1963
Camping and picnicking facilities	$6,038,000	+$2,649,100	+$2,738,000
Public service and administrative units, utilities and miscellaneous	21,841,000	−1,379,700	−2,062,000
Employee housing	3,000,000	+713,600	−950,000
Executive Mansion and grounds	347,000	+347,000	
Acquisition of lands and water rights	8,774,000	+944,000	−3,726,000
Total	40,000,000	+3,274,000	−4,000,000

The budget proposed a decrease of $88,900 in funds available for camping and picnicking facilities compared with 1962 and an increase of $1,663,600 for employee housing and $3,364,000 for extension of boundaries and acquiring inholdings in the national parks as discussed below. The Committee does not believe this shift in emphasis is warranted in light of the estimate of 81 million park visitors in 1963 and has revised the allocation as indicated above.

Within the amount allowed the Committee has provided $36,000 for construction of an amphitheater at Carlsbad Caverns, New Mexico, and $125,000 for the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Indiana, including $75,000 for acquisition of lands.

The Committee has disallowed the request of $200,000 for stabilization of the canal bed, banks, locks, etc., in the C&O Canal National Monument. The Committee does not believe that initiation of such major expenditures are warranted as long as the proposal of the Corps of Engineers to construct water resources projects in this area is under consideration.

The Committee has deleted the request of $228,000 for constructing a visitor center at the Cruz Bay Development in the Virgin Islands National Park. Considering the limited number of visitors to this park, the Committee believes that expenditures at this time should be restricted to higher priority areas in the National Park System.

The Committee has also deleted the request of $720,000 to initiate development of park areas in the Southwest Urban Renewal Area in the District of Columbia. Considering the delay being incurred in the construction of the inner-loop and related work in this area, this item can be readily deferred to permit more adequate review of this proposal which has an ultimate Federal cost of $2,270,000. The Committee does not believe that development of such park areas should be the complete responsibility of the Federal Government, but rather that a substantial portion of the cost should be assumed by the District of Columbia and the Redevelopment Land Agency. For example, the proposed Lansburgh Park, with an estimated cost of $684,000, would appear to meet the criteria under which the District of Columbia has heretofore assumed responsibility for the development of its playground and neighborhood parks. It is requested that the Park Service and interested agencies again review this proposal and recommend a more appropriate cost sharing plan.

CIVIL WAR AREAS

The Committee is especially concerned over the cost of National Park Service plans in Civil War Areas. During fiscal years 1957 to 1962 over $11.4 million has been expended for land acquisition and construction. The 1963 budget estimates include $5.1 million for this purpose and the Park Service has plans to expend an additional $16.9 million under its Mission 66 program. The Committee seriously questions whether expenditures of this magnitude are necessary or warranted in these areas considering the many and costly urgent requirements to provide more adequate park facilities for our expanding population. The Committee has therefore deleted $1,000,000 proposed in the estimates for construction of three visitor centers, a storage building, and the reconstruction of the Appomattox Court House, pending a thorough review of this program to determine if a less costly capital outlay would not be adequate for appropriate preservation of these historic sites.

LAND ACQUISITION

The $8,409,000 allowed for acquisition of lands includes $400,000 for Civil War areas, a decrease of $1,000,000 in the budget request; $4,000,000 for the Cape Cod National Seashore, Massachusetts;

$1,500,000 for Minute Man National Historical Park, Massachusetts; $509,000 for newly authorized parks; and $2,000,000 for acquiring inholdings and extending the boundaries of existing parks, a decrease of $1,864,000 in the budget request. The Committee does not believe the acquiring of costly inholdings in existing National Park areas is warranted where Federal ownership is extensive, such as Death Valley National Monument where present holdings total 1.9 million acres. In general, new funds should be reserved for acquiring new park lands which will meet urgent visitor requirements. The $2,000,000 allowed should make adequate provision for acquiring key inholdings essential to the management and protection of the existing parks. The Committee has specifically disallowed the request of $500,000 for acquiring an additional 25,000 acres in the Everglades National Park, Florida. The present Federal holdings, totaling over 1,300,000 acres are adequate for that area considering the many essential needs of the National Parks. The Committee has also denied the request of $110,000 for acquiring an additional 2,455 acres in the Joshua Tree National Monument where the Federal Government presently owns 505,000 acres.

In making the allowance of only $400,000 of the $1,400,000 requested for additional land acquisition in Civil War areas, the Committee has again considered the present annual cost of developing and maintaining over 84,000 acres of these lands already in Government ownership. More than $2,000,000 is required in this bill just for operation and maintenance of roads and facilities in these areas during fiscal year 1963. As each additional land purchase generates large additional costs over the years, future expansion in these areas should be held to acquisition of only the most essential tracts.

The Committee recommends continuation in fiscal year 1963 of the provision in the Conference Report (No. 797) on the 1962 bill providing that funds made available for acquisition of lands in Civil War areas are not to be obligated until the Secretary of the Interior has reported to the Committees on Appropriations that the local governments have adopted adequate zoning regulations to assure against future commercial development in these areas, except in those instances where the lands to be acquired are completely surrounded by lands already owned by the Federal Government or by lands on which the Federal Government has a scenic easement.

LAND OPPOSITE MOUNT VERNON

The Committee has disallowed the budget request of $937,000 to acquire land on the Potomac River shore opposite Mount Vernon, as authorized by Public Law 87–362. Authorization for acquiring these lands was rushed through the closing moments of the last session of Congress because of the threat to build a sewage treatment plant in the vicinity of Mockley Point which it was feared would mar the beauty of the Maryland shore. The basis for the passage of this legislation is clearly evident from the following quotation from Senate Report Number 1082, dated September 18, 1961, on H.J. Res. 459:

"Because of the prospective adjournment of Congress, both the Chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee have attempted to obtain assurance that no steps would be taken toward construction of the sewage disposal plant before Congress meets next year, *when there would be more time to consider the matter.*

In both instances, the efforts were without avail. A commitment was avoided. The only way to assure preservation of the site and the scene, and maintenance of the status-quo, is enactment of the Joint Resolution. *Congress can then, if it so desires, review the situation during its 1963 session.*" [Italic supplied.]

The Committee believes, after careful review and consideration of the following factors, that Federal appropriations for this purpose are not warranted:

(1) Since the passage of this legislation, the Washington Surburban Sanitary Commission has by resolution given assurance "that it will refrain from further consideration of a site on Mockley Point for a treatment plant" and "that the Commission will not consider nor finally select any site which would adversely affect or otherwise detract from the Mount Vernon vista."

(2) The Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission has recommended the new location planned for the sewage disposal plant in the lower valley of Piscataway Creek, more than a mile from its confluence with the Potomac River. This area is three miles from Mount Vernon and because of intervening woods is obscured from any view from Mount Vernon.

(3) The area in question is under adequate planning and zoning controls by the Prince Georges County Commissioners and the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission to preserve the view from Mount Vernon and prevent commercialization. The Maryland General Assembly in April, 1961, approved the extension of the regional district under the jurisdiction of the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission to include the area in question for purposes of planning, zoning, and subdivision control.

(4) Public Law 87–362 limited appropriations for acquiring the land in question to $937,600. This was based on the estimate that 586 acres would be acquired at a cost of only $1,600 per acre and that the acquisition of scenic easements on another 1,410 acres would be largely donated. It now appears that the per acre cost of this land will be considerably in excess of this estimate and that it will be necessary to pay for the scenic easements in many instances. It is apparent therefore that the present authorization and the budget request of $937,000 would be inadequate to accomplish the proposed acquisition and that an additional authorization would be necessary.

(5) The acreage in question is primarily owned by three families which have held the property (totaling 540 acres) for generations. No evidence was given to the Committee that these owners planned to dispose of their property or take any action that was not in keeping with the present rural character of this area or would not give satisfactory scenic easements.

In light of the above the Committee sees no compelling reason to make an exception to its policy that future acquisition of park lands in the Washington area, where the Federal Government now owns and maintains over 39,000 acres of such land, should generally be the responsibility of the local jurisdictions which enjoy some of the highest per capita incomes in the country. The Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission has recently announced plans to expend with the State of Maryland $30 million for some 19,000 acres of park land. The Commission should be in a position to acquire the acreage in question if it is determined desirable or necessary.

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The Committee has allowed $29,000,000, a decrease of $1,000,000 in the budget estimate and in the amount appropriated for 1962. This appropriation provides for liquidation of obligations incurred in the construction of parkways and roads and trails by the National Park Service under the contract authority provided in the Federal-Aid to Highway Act. The amount provided includes $2,793,800 for initiating construction of a Zoo by-pass in Rock Creek Park in the District of Columbia and $75,000 for initiating construction of roads and trails in the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Indiana.

The Committee has deleted the request of $213,200 for surfacing 32 miles of the C&O Canal tow path. As indicated above, the Committee believes that construction in the C&O Canal area should be held in abeyance pending consideration of proposals by the Corps of Engineers to construct water resource projects on the Potomac River in this area.

The Committee has also deleted the $168,700 programmed for buildings and utilities projects at Great Falls, Virginia. As the Committee has indicated previously, this appropriation is not available for a camp ground and related construction except on a very restricted basis adjacent to parkways. All items of this nature should hereafter be budgeted under the "Construction" appropriation.

Also disallowed is the $250,000 proposed for initiating construction of trails, roads, and parking areas in the Virgin Islands National Park. The Committee believes that the use of these funds should be restricted to areas of high visitor use until such time as higher priority items have been taken care of.

The additional reduction of $443,100 imposed in the budget request can be met readily through slippage in the construction program. As of January 31, 1962, there was an unobligated balance of over $25 million out of the $38.4 million available for the current fiscal year.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The Committee has allowed $1,900,000, an increase of $319,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $200,000 in the 1963 estimate. The amount allowed includes provision for the transfer to this item of $383,000 for the salaries and expenses of certain positions currently being financed from construction funds. The Committee action includes disallowance of the proposed establishment of a new division of international cooperation at a cost of $22,000. The

present staff should be able to absorb any essential workload under this activity. The reduction reflects a disallowance of 25 of the proposed additional permanent positions.

Office of Territories

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

The Committee recommends $13,768,000, an increase of $3,434,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $1,710,000 in the 1963 estimate. This item makes provision for the expenses of the Office of Territories and for support of the governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa and administration of Canton Island.

Of the amount allowed, $13,044,000 is for the support of American Samoa, an increase of $3,438,600 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $1,710,000 in the budget estimate. The amount allowed for American Samoa, together with $1,100,000 of local revenues, will provide $5,116,550 for operating expenses, an increase of $1,328,930 primarily for health, education, and welfare and $9,027,450 for construction including $2,828,750 for educational facilities, including 20 consolidated village schools; $272,000 for medical facilities; $2,273,850 for utilities; $600,000 for completion of the jet airfield; $943,000 for the road program; $1,869,000 for installation of a TV educational system, and $240,850 for other facilities.

The $1,710,000 disallowed in the budget request includes $710,000 in the original estimate for the TV system. It is believed that three channels should be adequate to initiate the system in lieu of the six channels proposed. Other reductions include $400,000 due to deferral until 1964 of the extension of the telephone system; $345,000 originally scheduled for a demonstration school and a teacher training college which will not be necessary in 1963 due to the conversion to the TV system; and $255,000 due to carryover balances and reprogramings.

In granting funds for salary increases to existing personnel the Committee expects that they will be granted only those teachers that are fully qualified and are capable of performing the work commensurate with the higher salary level. The Committee also recommends that the educational leave system in effect in the Island be discontinued and hereafter leave be taken as earned rather than allowed to accrue as a lump sum terminal payment.

The Committee is concerned about the present inadequate and inequitable tax system in effect in American Samoa and expects that the Governor will take appropriate steps to study and recommend necessary reforms at the earliest possible date.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The Committee has allowed $6,600,000, an increase of $296,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $3,400,000 in the budget request. The amount recommended is the maximum authorized under the current annual monetary limitation of $7,500,000 after taking into consideration the estimated transfer in 1963 of $900,000 from the Department of Navy to finance a portion of the cost of administration of the Saipan District. This district is to be transferred to the Department of Interior from the Navy on July 1, 1962. The Committee will give consideration to additional requirements for

administration of the Trust Territory as soon as pending legislation is passed amending the current monetary authorization.

The Committee has approved a proposed reprogramming of the 1963 request to permit the use of $200,000 in connection with the administration of the Saipan District which was not contemplated at the time the budget estimates were prepared.

Geological Survey

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $56,100,000, an increase of $6,280,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $3,800,000 and 183 permanent positions in the 1963 estimates. The amounts allowed by activities as compared with the 1962 appropriation and the estimates for 1963 are as follows:

Activity	Committee bill	Bill compared with—	
		1962 appropriation	Estimate, 1963
Topographic surveys and mapping	$19,500,000	+$2,590,000	
Geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping	15,020,000	+1,600,000	
Marine geology and hydrology	500,000	+500,000	−$500,000
Water resources investigations	[1] 15,430,000	+1,305,000	
Institute of water research			−1,900,000
Soil and moisture conservation	185,000		
Conservation of lands and minerals	4,065,000	+341,000	
General administration	1,700,000	+244,000	
Special-purpose building	100,000	+100,000	−1,000,000
Committee reduction in travel, supplies and materials and equipment	−400,000	−400,000	−400,000
Total	56,100,000	+6,280,000	−3,800,000

[1] Includes $900,000 for basic research projects.

The Committee has disallowed the proposed establishment of a new Institute of Water Research to be financed by transfer of basic research projects from the water resources investigations activity in the amount of $900,000 and a budget increase of $1,900,000. Although the Committee fully appreciates the importance of basic research in the field of water, it does not believe that there has been adequate time to fully develop the expanded program and to assure that there will be complete coordination and a lack of any duplication with the work being performed by the numerous other federal agencies in the general field of water research. In this connection, it was not possible for the agency to furnish the Committee at this time data on the work being performed or expenditures by other Federal agencies in this field pending the completion of a current study by a Committee under the auspices of the President's Science Advisor and the Federal Council of Science and Technology. It is believed desirable, therefore, to defer this matter until more complete information is available for appraisal.

The Committee has allowed $500,000 of the proposed increase of $1,000,000 for research on geologic and hydrologic processes in oceanic areas. With a current base of $425,000, this allowance will make a total available of $925,000. This appears to be all that is warranted

for expansion of this program pending extension of the Bureau's authorization for work in this area.

The Committee has allowed $100,000 for planning the proposed nuclear research building at Denver, Colorado, but has deferred consideration of the construction estimate until fiscal year 1964. The Committee questions the need for a building for this purpose at a cost of $900,000 and expects that the Agency will make every effort to design a less expensive building.

Bureau of Mines

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

The Committee has allowed an appropriation of $26,550,000, an increase of $1,750,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $450,000 in the budget estimate. The amount provided by activity compared with the 1962 appropriation and the estimate for 1963 is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1963	Bill compared with—	
		1962 appropriation	Estimate, 1963
Bituminous coal	$7,214,000	+$350,000	
Anthracite coal	1,042,000	+50,000	
Petroleum, natural gas, and oil shale	3,271,000		−$187,000
Minerals and metals	14,786,000	+1,746,000	
Foreign mineral activities	500,000	+134,000	
Committee reduction in travel, supplies, and materials and equipment	−263,000	−263,000	−263,000
Transfers in the estimates		−267,000	
Total	26,550,000	+1,750,000	−450,000

The Committee has disallowed the proposed increase of $187,000 and 17 permanent positions to expand oil shale research. Effective use of the $733,000 allowed for continuation of this research should be adequate for fiscal year 1963.

It was testified by the new Office of Coal Research, as discussed below, that it has received many meritorious contract proposals to develop new methods of mining, preparing, and utilizing coal. As the Bureau of Mines has well qualified personnel and adequate facilities available for coal research, the Committee directs that not less than $500,000 of the $8,256,000 provided in the bill for bituminous and anthracite coal research be reprogrammed to undertake some of these high priority projects. It is believed that the Bureau can readily curtail and defer some of the long-run research projects which it has had underway for several years without any serious loss in order to permit it to undertake some of these new short-run projects which appear to have great promise for the coal industry. It is requested that the Bureau furnish a statement of its reprograming to the Committee by July 1, 1962.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of $8,158,000, an increase of $958,000 in the 1962 appropriation. On an available funds basis, the increase is $646,000 due to transfers in the estimates

and the availability of unobligated balances from prior years. This item finances Federal coal mine inspections; health and safety research; and the control of fires in coal deposits.

The increases allowed include: $200,000 for appraisal of health and safety conditions in non-coal mines as authorized by Public Law 87–300; $102,000 for within-grade salary increases; $169,000 for research on and testing of respiratory equipment; and $175,000 to provide for diesel equipment research and testing.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $425,000, a decrease of $410,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $575,000 in the 1963 estimates. The estimate was proposed for the design and preparation of engineering plans and specifications in connection with the relocation of the fuels and health and safety research functions from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Bruceton, Pa., and the proposed construction of a new materials research center at Frederick, Md. The amount allowed provides the necessary funds for preparing the drawings and specifications for these two laboratories during fiscal year 1963. The remainder of the request can be deferred until funds for construction of these facilities are considered.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The Committee recommends the budget request of $1,333,000, an increase of $43,000 in the 1962 appropriation to expand the internal auditing program, for purchase and rental of accounting equipment, and for within-grade salary increases. The Committee has also approved the budget request to use not to exceed $1,615,000 of program funds for administrative expenses.

DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HELIUM PROPERTIES

The Committee recommends an additional borrowing authority of $6,000,000, a decrease of $4,000,000 in the borrowing authority provided for the current fiscal year, and a decrease of $14,000,000 in the budget request.

This program, authorized by the Helium Act amendments approved September 13, 1960, provides for the conservation of helium now going to fuel markets as non-combustible components of some natural gases. Under the program private industry is being encouraged to finance, construct, and operate up to twelve plants for the production of helium which will be purchased by the Government under long-term contracts. Helium so acquired will be stored in the Government-owned Cliffside gas field near Amarillo, Texas, until needed to meet demands. The borrowing authority will be used to finance payments under these contracts. To date, the Department has entered into four such contracts for the purchase of an estimated 62 billion cubic feet of helium over a 22-year period. As these plants are still under construction and will be in operation for only a portion of fiscal year 1963, it is now estimated that helium purchases will total only about $25.5 million. With the availability of income from helium sales, a borrowing authority of

only $16,000,000 will be needed, of which $10,000,000 is currently available.

The budget proposed the construction of a new administration building for helium operations at Amarillo, Texas, at a cost of $1,500,000. The Committee believes that the present facilities, together with the rental of such private space as may be necessary, should be adequate to house the headquarters.

Office of Coal Research

The Committee recommends the estimate of $2,000,000, an increase of $1,000,000 in the 1962 appropriation, to provide for contract research to develop new methods of mining, preparing, and utilizing coal. The Committee was advised that the Office of Coal Research has received numerous promising proposals for undertaking studies in entirely new areas in research and development that might result in substantial progress toward alleviation of the distressed conditions that prevail in the coal industry and strengthen the competitive position of coal as an important basic natural resource. It has been the policy for this new Office to concentrate its efforts on short-range projects aimed at providing the most immediate assistance to the coal industry while the Bureau of Mines has placed emphasis on longer-term and more basic coal research. As indicated above, the Committee has directed the Bureau of Mines to reprogram at least $500,000 of the $8.2 million appropriated to it in the bill for coal research to undertake some of these high priority short-range projects which cannot be implemented within the funds available to the Office of Coal Research.

The Committee has allowed $300,000 for administration and supervision of the program, an increase of $75,000 in the 1962 limitation and a decrease of $10,000 in the budget request. This amount will provide a staff of 25 positions for the Office of Coal Research which should be adequate to conduct the contract research program.

Office of Minerals Exploration

The Committee recomends an allowance of $750,000, the same as the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $250,000 in the budget estimate. This program provides for Government loans to private industry for discovery of mineral reserves. The Government contributes not more than 50 percent of the cost which is repaid with interest if the exploration is successful.

The Committee wishes to reiterate its position that emphasis should be placed on providing exploration assistance on only those strategic and critical minerals for which there is a serious shortage in the United States. As lead, zinc, copper and nickel do not meet this criteria, the Committee directs that exploration loans for these minerals be discontinued. As the current loan program has primarily involved these particular minerals, the allowance of $750,000 should be adequate for the program in fiscal year 1963.

The Committee recommends a limitation of $213,600 on administrative and technical services, the same as 1962, and a decrease of $16,400 in the budget request.

Lead and Zinc Stabilization Program

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $2,450,000, a decrease of $2,450,000 in the budget estimate. The budget estimate provided for the cost of the program for the calendar year January 1, 1963 to December 31, 1963. The amount allowed will provide for full requirements for the six months period January 1, 1963 to June 30, 1963, at which time it is contemplated that appropriations for this program will be converted to a full fiscal-year basis.

This program, authorized by the act of August 3, 1961, provides for stabilization payments for lead and zinc ores and concentrates in order to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers. The amount provided is in accordance with the maximum payments specified in the act of $4,500,000 for calendar year 1963. Pending before Congress, is a supplemental estimate to cover the initial cost of the program for the period January 1, 1962 to December 31, 1962.

The Committee expects the Department to take all steps necessary in the administration of the contracts and in advising producers to assure that the Federal obligation under the program is limited to the maximum payments authorized in the law.

Office of Oil and Gas

The Committee recommends $531,000, the same as the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $200,000 in the budget request. The amount disallowed represents the proposed transfer in the estimates of $115,000 from the Office of Emergency Planning and a proposed increase of $85,000 for financing defense mobilization activities in the oil and gas field. It is planned that these items will be considered separately in a subsequent appropriation bill.

This appropriation provides for coordination of oil and gas activities, administration of the oil import program, and expenses of the Oil Import Appeals Board.

Office of Minerals Mobilization

The Committee has deleted from the bill the budget proposal that beginning in fiscal year 1963 the $180,000 for minerals mobilization activities which has previously been appropriated to the Office of Emergency Planning be appropriated directly to the Department. As indicated above, it is planned that defense mobilization functions will be considered separately in a later appropriation bill.

Fish and Wildlife Service

office of the commissioner of fish and wildlife

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of $364,000, the same as the amount available for the current fiscal year, for expenses of the Office of the Commissioner.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

management and investigations of resources

The Committee recommends an allowance of $14,600,000, an increase of $2,050,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of

$613,000 in the 1963 estimate. The amounts allowed by the Committee by activity compared with the 1962 appropriation and the 1963 budget estimates are as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1962	Compared with—	
		1962 appropriation	Estimate, 1963
Enforcement management	$376,000	+$7,000	
Marketing and technology	3,132,000	+463,464	
Research	7,555,000	+937,000	
Research of fish migration over dams	1,499,000	+575,000	−$500,000
Fishing vessel mortgage insurance	51,000		
Columbia River Fishery facilities	2,100,000	+185,000	
Committee reduction in travel, supplies and materials and equipment	−113,000	−113,000	−113,000
Net transfer in the estimates		−4,464	
Total	14,600,000	+2,050,000	−613,000

In addition to the direct appropriation of $1,499,000 allowed for research on fish migration over dams, it is expected that the Bureau will continue to use $250,000 from the permanent appropriation of customs duties on fishery products. Effective use of the total provided of $1,749,000 should be adequate for requirements in fiscal year 1963.

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

(SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of $300,000, the same as the 1962 appropriation, to continue the research program conducted in foreign countries with foreign currencies.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends $7,900,000, an increase of $339,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $514,000 in the 1963 estimate. The amount allowed includes $2,002,000 for construction of a research laboratory at Seattle, Washington; $1,198,000 for construction of a biological laboratory at Ann Arbor, Michigan; $394,000 for construction of a radiobiological Laboratory at Beaufort, North Carolina; $2,500,000 for construction of a fishery research vessel to replace the Black Douglas in the eastern Pacific; $150,000 for design of a fishery research vessel for use in the North Pacific and Bering Sea; $30,000 for rehabilitation of facilities at St. Simons Island, Georgia; and $1,626,000 for construction of Columbia River fishery facilities.

The decreases represent a disallowance of $505,000 for equipment included in the estimates for construction of the laboratories at Seattle, Washington, and Ann Arbor, Michigan, the purchase of which can be deferred to fiscal year 1964, and $9,000 in the Columbia River fisheries facilities program.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

The Committee has allowed the budget estimate of $750,000, the same as the 1962 appropriation. This activity covers the payment of subsidies for the construction of fishing vessels in the U.S. shipyards under the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The Committee has allowed $600,000, an increase of $118,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $16,000 in the 1963 estimate. The increase provided includes $50,000 for an internal audit unit; $25,000 for additional staff at the Ann Arbor, Mich., regional office; and a non-recurring increase of $39,000 for the purchase of bookkeeping machines.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

The Committee recommends the budget request of $1,998,000 for administration of the Pribilof Islands, an increase of $17,000 in the amount available for the current fiscal year. These funds are derived from the sale of fur skins and other wildlife products of the Islands and are used for management of the Alaska fur-seal herd, furnishing schooling, medical attention, and other services to the natives of the Islands, and operation and maintenance of facilities.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $26,500,000, an increase of $3,184,350 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $72,000 in the 1963 estimate. The amounts allowed by the Committee by activity compared with the 1962 appropriations and the 1963 budget estimates are as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1962	Compared with—	
		1962 appropriation	Estimate, 1963
Operation and maintenance of fish hatcheries	$6,181,000	+$473,500	
Extension and training	267,000	+30,000	+$30,000
Fishery research	1,654,000	+205,000	−50,000
Administration of wildlife resources and refuges	11,370,000	+1,488,000	
Control of predatory animals and injurious rodents	2,506,000	+3,000	
Wildlife research	2,700,000	+400,000	+10,000
Soil and moisture conservation	705,000	+497,000	
River basin studies	1,179,000	+125,193	
Committee reduction in equipment	−62,000	−62,000	−62,000
Net transfer in the estimates		+24,657	
Total	26,500,000	+3,184,350	−72,000

The Committee has provided an increase in the budget estimate of $200,000 to expand research work on the control of black birds and starlings. With the base amount of $170,000, a total of $370,000 will be available for this work in fiscal year 1963. The Committee has also added $30,000 for the establishment of a cooperative fishery unit at the University of Maine, as authorized by the Act of September 2, 1960.

The Committee has denied the request to appropriate $190,000 under this item to continue studies of bird hazards to aircraft being conducted for the Federal Aviation Authority. The FAA has been financing this program for the last two years and because of the nature of the work, it is believed appropriate to continue financing under the FAA appropriation. The Committee has also denied the increase

requested of $50,000 under Fishery research to replace Federal-aid reverted funds. It now appears that adequate funds will be available from this source in fiscal year 1963. The Committee reduction of $62,000 in equipment is due primarily to the disallowance of the proposed addition of 36 passenger motor vehicles.

CONSTRUCTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $4,900,000, a decrease of $357,500 in the 1962 appropriation, and an increase of $814,000 in the 1963 estimate. This item finances the construction of fish hatchery and wildlife refuge facilities and fishery and wildlife research facilities. The amount provided includes the budget request of $654,000 for continued construction of five new hatcheries and the improvement of one existing hatchery; $325,000 for fishery research facilities; $2,928,000 for construction on 18 wildlife refuges; and $179,000 for wildlife research facilities.

In addition, the Committee has included $195,000 to initiate construction of the Dale Hollow Dam Hatchery, Tennessee, and funds to continue construction of the following hatcheries: Orangeburg, South Carolina, $141,000; Norfolk, Arkansas, $185,000; Chattahoochee Forest, Georgia, $134,000; and Wytheville, Virginia, $175,000.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of $7,000,000 to initiate the expanded wetlands acquisition program authorized by the act of October 4, 1961 (Public Law 87–383). This amount, together with the estimated $5,000,000 to be available from receipts from the sale of Federal hunting stamps, will provide a total in the Migratory Bird Conservation Fund of $12,000,000 for fiscal year 1963. It is estimated that this sum will provide for the acquisition of 259,000 acres of land of which 116,000 will be for migratory waterfowl refuges. The remainder will be for the waterfowl production area program with 60,000 acres to be acquired in fee and 83,000 acres controlled by easement. The Committee has disallowed 35 of the 235 positions requested for administration of the program.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,250,000, an increase of $179,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $81,000 in the 1963 estimate. The amount allowed, together with not to exceed $395,000 of funds available from other sources, should provide adequately for administrative expenses in fiscal year 1963. The Committee action includes disallowance of six of the additional permanent positions requested.

Office of Saline Water

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $7,600,000, an increase of $2,345,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $100,000 in the 1963 estimates, for continuation of research to develop low cost processes for converting saline water to fresh water in quantities sufficient for municipal, industrial and agricultural use.

The amount allowed includes $3,275,000 for basic research, $3,800,000 for applied research, and $525,000 for administration and coordination. The latter reflects a decrease of $100,000 in the budget estimate of $625,000. The amount allowed, which includes an increase of $175,000 over the 1962 figure, will provide adequately for administration and coordination of a research program of this size. The allowance reflects a reduction of ten of the additional permanent positions requested.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The Committee recommends an allowance of $2,000,000, an increase of $745,312 over the amount available for this purpose during the current fiscal year in the appropriation item, "Construction, Operation, and Maintenance," and a decrease of $85,000 in the 1963 estimate. The increase provides for the operation of the two additional saline water demonstration plants which will be in operation on a partial year basis in 1963 and for operation of the three plants which will be operated on a full-year basis.

The Committee has placed a limitation of $175,000 on the amount to be available for administration, a decrease of $50,000 in the budget request. This amount, which provides for fourteen permanent positions, six less than requested, should provide an adequate engineering staff to administer the demonstration plant program.

Office of the Solicitor

The Committee has allowed $3,600,000 for the legal services of the Department, an increase of $108,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $147,000 in the budget request. The increase, which provides for twenty additional positions, six less than requested, should provide adequately for the anticipated increased work load in the Office.

Office of the Secretary

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $3,350,000, a decrease of $35,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $218,000 and 15 permanent positions in the 1963 budget estimate. Due to a nonrecurring item of $200,000 in the current fiscal year, the actual increase provided over 1962 is $165,000. The increase allowed includes $50,000 to provide 4 additional positions in the Office of Information compared with the requested increase of $121,500; $50,000 of the requested increase of $90,000 for administrative management services; $39,000 for program direction and coordination; $14,000 for the Office of the Secretary and the Under Secretary; and $12,000 for increased per diem costs.

The Committee has deleted the request to appropriate $106,500 under this item for defense activities previously financed under the Office of Emergency Planning. As indicated above, it is planned to consider these activities separately in a subsequent appropriation bill.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture—Forest Service

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

The Committee recommends under this heading a total of $177,175,000, an increase of $7,007,000 in the 1962 appropriation and

a decrease of $2,515,000 in the 1963 estimates. Following is a summary of the action taken on the programs included under this appropriation.

Forest land management.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $138,400,000, an increase of $10,400,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $2,340,000 in the budget estimate.

The amount allowed by the Committee by activities in comparison with the 1962 appropriation and the 1963 budget estimate are indicated in the following table:

Project	Committee bill	Compared with—	
		Available, 1962	Estimate, 1963
Forest Land Management:			
a. National forest protection and management:			
(1) Timber resource management:			
(a) Sales administration and management	$22,380,000	−$400,000	−$800,000
(b) Reforestation and stand improvement	15,250,000	+2,500,000	
(2) Recreation-puhlic use	26,120,000	+5,620,000	
(3) Wildlife hahitat management	3,420,000	+200,000	
(4) Range resource management:			
(a) Management	4,710,000	+100,000	
(b) Revegetation	2,660,000	+120,000	
(c) Improvements	3,180,000		
(5) Soil and water management	4,490,000	+400,000	
(6) Mineral claims, leases and other land uses	7,200,000	+400,000	
(7) Forest fire protection	21,790,000	+1,400,000	
(8) Structural improvements for fire and general purposes (construction and maintenance)	12,140,000	+359,000	
(9) Rehabilitation of hurns	1,050,000		
Deduct amount advanced from "Cooperative range improvements"	−700,000		
Subtotal, national forest protection and management	123,690,000	+10,699,000	−800,000
b. Fighting forest fires	5,000,000		
c. Insect and disease control:			
(1) White pine hlister rust control	3,465,000	+100,000	
(2) Other pest control	6,985,000	+1,000,000	−300,000
Subtotal, Insect and disease control	10,450,000	+1,100,000	−300,000
d. Acquisition of lands (Weeks Act)	300,000		−200,000
Less Committee reduction in travel, supplies and materials and equipment	−1,040,000	−1,040,000	−1,040,000
Transfer in the estimate		−359,000	
Total, Forest Land Management	138,400,000	+10,400,000	−2,340,000

Because of the depressed timber market, the Committee believes that the Forest Service can readily absorb the reduction of $800,000 and 100 permanent positions applied against the activity, "Sales administration and management." The Committee has granted sizable increases in this activity in recent years and the $22,380,000 allowed should finance adequately the workload in 1963. The amount allowed includes an additional $400,000 for special small and salvage sales.

The $300,000 allowed for acquisition of land, a decrease of $200,000 in the budget request, should provide for acquiring essential tracts in fiscal year 1963. It should be noted that the Committee approved an increase in this item from $100,000 to $300,000 in fiscal year 1962.

In disallowing $300,000 of the requested increase of $1,300,000 for "Other pest control" work, the Committee believes that the $6,985,000 allowed is all that is warranted without firmer estimates of the infestations to be encountered in the next fiscal year.

Within the total provided it is expected that the Forest Service will make $30,000 available for continuing the forestry work in the Virgin Islands which has heretofore been financed under the appropriation to the Virgin Islands Corporation.

Forest research.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of $22,975,000, a decrease of $3,393,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $175,000 in the 1963 estimates. Due to nonrecurring funds for construction of research facilities in the current year, the amount allowed provides an effective increase of $1,052,000 for expansion of forestry research. The decrease made by the Committee reflects a general reduction in the funds requested for travel, supplies, materials, and equipment.

The amount allowed in the Committee bill by activity compared with the 1962 appropriation and the 1963 estimates is as follows:

Project	Committee bill	Compared with—	
		Available, 1962	Estimate, 1963
Forest Research:			
a. Forest and range management research	$10,214,000	+$477,000	
b. Forest protection research:			
(1) Forest fire research	1,479,000	+130,000	
(2) Forest insect research	1,725,000	+135,000	
(3) Forest disease research	1,525,000	+120,000	
Subtotal, Forest protection research	4,729,000	+385,000	
c. Forest products and engineering research	4,717,000	+240,000	
d. Forest resources research:			
(1) Forest survey	1,583,000		
(2) Economics research	1,157,000	+125,000	
Subtotal, Forest resources research	2,740,000	+125,000	
e. Forest research construction	750,000	−4,445,000	
Less committee reduction in travel, supplies and materials, and equipment	−175,000	−175,000	−$175,000
Total, forest research	22,975,000	−3,393,000	−175,000

State and private forestry cooperation.—The Committee has allowed $15,800,000, the same as available for fiscal year 1962 and the 1963 budget estimate. This program, carried on in cooperation with the States, encourages private timber management. The amount allowed includes $12,465,500 for cooperation in forest fire control; $296,000 for cooperation in forest tree planting; $2,500,000 for cooperation in forest management and processing; and $538,500 for general forestry assistance.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

The Committee has allowed an appropriation of $37,500,000, an increase of $2,500,000 in the 1962 appropriation and the same as the budget estimate. These funds, the maximum authorized for the construction and maintenance of forest roads and trails, are required to liquidate the obligations incurred pursuant to the authorization contained in the Federal Highway Acts. It is estimated that this amount, together with the permanent appropriation of 10 percent of the national forestry receipts and the planned road construction of

timber purchasers under timber sales contracts, will provide a total road program in 1963 of over $95,000,000.

ACCESS ROADS

The Committee has deleted the budget request of $2,000,000 to continue this special appropriation item for acquiring by purchase private roads needed to provide access to national forest areas. Funds have been appropriated under this item for the past three fiscal years as it was assumed that the Forest Service did not have authority under the regular Forest roads and trails appropriation to require cost sharing charges of benefiting private land owners. As the Comptroller General ruled on March 2, 1962, that the regular Forest roads and trails appropriation is available for this purpose, the Committee believes the continuation of this item is no longer warranted and that financing of the road program should hereafter be restricted to the authorization contained in the Federal Highway Act.

ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

The Committee has approved the budget request of $2,000,000 to complete the acquisition of lands in the wilderness canoe area in the Superior National Forest. The amount provided represents the full amount of the additional authorization provided in the Act of October 4, 1961. This amount, together with the previous appropriations of $2,500,000 authorized in the Act of June 22, 1948, make a total of $4,500,000 for acquiring these lands. Approximately 40,000 acres of land have been acquired to date and about 15,000 additional acres will be acquired with the additional funds made available. The Committee expects that the Forest Service will complete the program within the appropriation provided.

SPECIAL ACTS

The budget request for the appropriation of $10,000 from National Forest receipts for acquisition of land in the Cache National Forest, Utah, has been approved. This amount will permit continuation of the program for control of soil erosion and flood damage in this area at the current level.

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

The Committee has approved the budget estimate of $700,000, the same as the 1962 appropriation. The funds are appropriated from grazing fees for protection and improvement of the range.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

The Committee has approved the budget request of $1,000,000, the same as the 1962 appropriation, for assistance to the States for tree planting under Title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1956. These funds will be used to provide advice, technical assistance, and financial contribution to carry out increased tree planting and reforestation work on non-Federal forest land. These funds must be matched by the States and the work is conducted in accordance with plans submitted by the States and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of $70,000, the same as the 1962 appropriation. The Board adjudicates appeals by coal mine operators from orders issued by the Bureau of Mines in the interest of safety.

Commission on Fine Arts

The Committee has allowed $70,000, the same as the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $10,000 in the budget estimate. Funds appropriated to the Commission have doubled since fiscal year 1958 and the Commission should be able to finance its activities within the present appropriation level.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

The Committee has allowed $55,284,000, an increase of $2,274,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $550,000 in the budget estimate. This decrease results from the Committee disallowance of the budget proposal that a direct appropriation be provided to replace the present practice of making advance purchases for Alaska activities out of the current year's appropriation as provided by 58 Stat. 266 and 42 U.S.C., 2001. The Committee believes that the present procedure is adequate and recommends its continuation.

The amount allowed includes $33,295,000 for provision of hospital health services to the Indians, consisting of 47 general hospitals and their outpatient clinics and 3 tuberculosis sanitoria; $10,700,000 for contract patient care in non-Federal hospitals and by private physicians where Indian hospital or medical care facilities are not available; $9,787,000 for the field health services program; and $1,502,000 for administration.

Increases allowed over 1962 include $565,000 for additional hospital health services; $283,000 for additional maintenance and repair of facilities; $932,000 for increased contractual services with hospitals and physicians; and $529,427 for expansion of the field health services.

CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $8,320,000, an increase of $35,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $900,000 in the budget estimate. The reduction has been made against the estimate of $4,000,000 for construction of Indian sanitation facilities. The $900,000 decrease represents $400,000 programmed in the budget as a carryover to fiscal year 1964 and an additional $500,000 for anticipated slippage in the obligation program. The Committee believes this is a very worthwhile program. However, the agency has experienced considerable delay in implementing this program and had unobligated as of December 31, 1961, $3,187,000. It is believed, therefore, that the funds allowed of $3,100,000, together with the considerable unobligated balance to be carried forward, should provide all that the agency can effectively use in fiscal year 1963.

The appropriation allowed includes $3,508,000 for construction of new hospitals and clinics, including replacement of the existing facility at Fort Yates, North Dakota; replacement of the hospital at Barrow, Alaska; and construction of three new health centers, and three new health stations; $535,000 for additional personnel quarters; $1,377,000 for alterations to existing facilities; and $100,000 for participation in the construction of a community hospital at Chamberlain, South Dakota.

Indian Claims Commission

The Committee recommends an allowance of $290,000, an increase of $10,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $5,000 in the 1963 budget estimate. The increase will provide for additional expenses of the Commission, including the addition of two clerks and the increased salaries of the Commissioners. This independent Commission hears and determines Indian claims existing before August 13, 1946.

National Capital Planning Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee has allowed the budget request of $625,000, an increase of $100,000 in the 1962 appropriation. The increase includes a non-recurring item of $95,000 for moving expenses and rental costs incident to the relocation of the Commission to private office space in fiscal year 1963.

The Commission is responsible for planning the development of the National Capital and the conservation of its natural and historical features. The amount provided also includes funds for the National Capital Regional Planning Council which coordinates planning in the counties and cities of the metropolitan area.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OPEN SPACE STUDY, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

The Committee has deleted the budget request of $65,000 for consulting services to undertake an open space study for the National Capital region in cooperation with the local governments of the area. The Committee believes that any expenditures which may be necessary in connection with such a study should be financed from the above appropriation for salaries and expenses of the National Capital Planning Commission. The Commission exists for activities such as this and should be able to undertake such work within the $625,000 provided in the bill.

LAND ACQUISITION, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK, PARKWAY, AND PLAYGROUND SYSTEM

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $100,000, a reduction of $400,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $1,200,000 in the budget request. The $100,000, which is to be matched by an equal amount by Maryland, is to complete acquisition of all the lands required for the George Washington Memorial Parkway from the District of Columbia line to the Cabin John Bridge in Montgomery County, Maryland and the connecting roadway between the Parkway and Little Falls Branch Parkway.

The Committee has again deleted the budget item of $1,200,000 to resume the acquisition of local stream valley parks in Montgomery County, Maryland, and in Arlington and Fairfax counties, and Alexandria, Virginia. The Committee sees no reason to change its position of a year ago when it stated "The $3,700,000 which has been appropriated to date for this purpose, including $1,900,000 in loans, represents the maximum Federal participation that can be justified in the light of the serious Federal budgetary situation. Conditions, affecting both the Federal Government and the localities involved, have materially changed the basis on which this program was authorized by Congress thirty-one years ago. With the rapid settlement of these areas in recent years with families whose incomes are among the highest in the Nation, there is no question but what these jurisdictions can now well afford to make adequate provision for their requirements without further assistance from the Federal Government."

National Capital Transportation Agency

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee has allowed an appropriation of $3,350,000 an increase of $2,390,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $1,100,000 in the budget request. The Committee allowance will provide an additional 14 positions, making a total staff of 84 in lieu of the 98 requested. Considering that the agency will have completed its report to the President on organization and financial arrangements for transportation in the National Capital region by November 1, 1962, the total staff allowed should be adequate to continue work on the transit development program pending Congressional review of the President's recommendations.

The amount allowed includes $550,000 for engineering plans; $1,300,000 for engineering feasibility analyses; $250,000 for planning and economic studies; $950,000 for personnel compensation and staffing; and $300,000 for other expenses including personnel benefits, travel, rent, supplies and equipment.

The Committee requests that the justifications for next fiscal year be presented on an activity basis, showing the comparison between the actual, current, and the budget year, and that accounting records be maintained on an activity basis.

LAND ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

The Committee has approved an appropriation of $400,000, a decrease of $600,000 in the 1962 appropriation, and a decrease of $1,600,000 in the budget estimate. The amount provided is to continue the acquisition of land for extra-wide median strips in Interstate Route 66 in Virginia and Interstate Route 95 in Maryland, and for incidental construction on the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Maryland. The sum of $1,000,000 was appropriated for the current year for acquisition of the extra-wide median strips and the Committee believes that it is expedient to continue such purchases in fiscal year 1963 while land is being acquired for these new highways. The Committee believes, however, that such funds should be expended only with the certainty that these areas will be used for future express transit facilities and, therefore, has made all purchases subject to the advance approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

The Committee has disallowed the budget request of $1,600,000 for the acquisition of land for future transit stations and related parking areas in connection with these highways as well as the proposed reprogramming to expend funds for this purpose during the current year. The Committee does not believe that capital expenditures of this nature are warranted until such time as the Agency's report has been submitted to Congress as required by the authorizing act and a definite construction program for transit facilities has been authorized, including provision for financing. In this connection, the Committee expects that any implementation of such a construction program, with an estimated ultimate cost of a billion dollars, will provide for substantial financial contributions by the District of Columbia and the surrounding local jurisdictions which would benefit from such a system.

Smithsonian Institution

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $10,900,000, an increase of $1,775,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a net decrease of $454,000 in the budget estimate. The reduction reflects a saving of $500,000 in operation and maintenance costs of the new Museum of History and Technology due to a six months delay in the completion date, and an allowance of $46,000 required for wage board increases.

Increases allowed include $698,000 for additional expenses in connection with the new Museum of History and Technology building and the additions to the Natural History building; $295,000 for additional scientific research; $250,000 for expanding the Museum's efforts in the field of oceanography; $152,000 for additional requirements in connection with the National Collection of Fine Arts, National Portrait Gallery, and the National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board; and a net increase of $380,000 for other additional operating expenses of the Institution.

REMODELING OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION BUILDING

The Committee has deleted without prejudice the budget request of $5,400,000 for remodeling the existing Civil Service Commission Building (formerly known as the Patent Office Building) to make it suitable as an Art Gallery to house the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery of the Smithsonian Institution. Since preparation of the budget estimate delays have been encountered in the construction of the new building to house the Civil Service Commission, and the present building will not be vacated prior to August, 1963. Construction funds to initiate the remodeling will, therefore, not be required before fiscal year 1964.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

The Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,275,000, an increase of $325,000 in the budget estimate, to initiate a ten-year program of capital improvements at the National Zoological Park. The District of Columbia will continue to finance the operation and maintenance of the zoo.

The appropriation will provide for reconstruction of the access road, reconstruction of the bird flight cage, and improvements to the existing bird exhibition building. The budget estimate included

$97,000 to initiate relocation of the existing east-west road from Connecticut Avenue to Harvard Street. The Committee has included the increase of $325,000 in the budget in order to fully finance this relocation during fiscal year 1963.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of $2,054,000, an increase of $122,000 in the 1962 appropriation. The increase is primarily required to initiate the first year of a two-year program to repair the skylights at the Gallery.

Transitional Grants to Alaska

The Committee has approved the budget request of $3,000,000, a decrease of $3,000,000 in the 1962 appropriation. The amount provided is the maximum authorized by law for fiscal year 1963 to facilitate assumption by the State of Alaska of the responsibilities heretofore performed by the Federal Government. The Alaska Omnibus Act provides for grants for the five-year period between 1960 and 1964. The amount authorized for fiscal year 1964 is also $3,000,000.

Civil War Centennial Commission

The Committee recommends the budget request of $100,000, the same as the 1962 appropriation, for financing the activities of the Commission during fiscal year 1963. The Commission is responsible for preparing plans and programs to provide for appropriate Nationwide observances and the coordination of ceremonies to commemorate the Civil War.

TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Contributions

The Committee has denied the budget request of $185,000 for payment to the Virgin Islands Corporation, including $145,000 to cover losses sustained by the Corporation during fiscal year 1961 and $40,000 for the forestry and other agricultural programs. As dissolution of the Corporation is being considered and the Corporation has adequate capital to cover its losses, the Committee does not believe that the requested appropriation is necessary. As indicated above, the Committee has made provision for the U.S. Forest Service to continue to finance the forestry program.

Revolving Fund

The Committee has allowed an appropriation of $200,000, a decrease of $681,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $3,100,000 in the budget estimate. The amount proposed in the budget estimate was for expansion of power distribution facilities in the Virgin Islands. As the Board of Directors of the Corporation has adopted a resolution proposing the transfer to the Virgin Islands Government of the physical and other assets of the Corporation and legislation to accomplish this is pending in the Bureau of the Budget, the Committee does not believe it is appropriate to authorize extensive additional Federal funding at this time. To meet the most urgent power re-

quirements on the Island of St. Thomas, however, the Committee has approved a requested 1962 reprogramming to provide $400,000 for the purchase of a generator and has included the $200,000 in the bill to permit construction of a building to house and install the new unit early in fiscal year 1963.

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation

The Committee has allowed an administrative expense limitation of $180,000, the same as 1962, and a decrease of $20,000 in the budget request.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 16 in connection with Geological Survey, administrative provisions:

and payment of contributions to the International Union on Geologic Sciences;

On page 25 in connection with the Office of Saline Water, operation and maintenance:

of which not to exceed $175,000 shall be available for administration.

On page 25 in connection with the Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses:

not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses,

On pages 26 and 27 in connection with the General Provisions, Department of the Interior:

and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft, or other equipment in connection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof.

On page 37 in connection with the National Capital Transportation Agency, land acquisition and construction:

Provided, That such land purchases shall be subject to the advance approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

On page 38 in connection with the Smithsonian Institution, construction and improvements, National Zoological Park:

Provided, That such portion of this amount as may be necessary may be transferred to the District of Columbia

On page 40 in connection with General Provisions, Related Agencies:

The per diem rate, unless an agency is otherwise limited by law to payment of a lesser per diem, paid from appropriations made available under this title for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), shall not exceed $75.

TRUST FUNDS

(Not a charge against general budget revenues)

	Appropriation estimate, 1962	Appropriation estimate, 1963	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Department of the Interior: [1]			
Deposits by individuals for surveying public lands	$25,000	$25,000	----------
Administration and protection of grazing districts	400,000	400,000	----------
Trust funds, Alaska townsites, Bureau of Land Management	29,000	29,000	----------
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	2,005,879	2,059,000	+$53,121
Miscellaneous trust funds of Indian tribes	79,340,327	54,183,000	−25,157,327
Donations, including land, National Parks	800,000	300,000	−500,000
Gifts or bequests of personal property, National Parks	5,000	5,000	----------
Birthplace of Abraham Lincoln, preservation of, National Parks	2,540	2,540	----------
Contributions, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial	2,832,517	----------	−2,832,517
Advances, authorized services, Geological Survey	2,300,000	2,300,000	----------
Contributed funds, Bureau of Mines	1,120,000	1,020,000	−100,000
Contributed funds, Bureau of Commerical Fisheries	747,000	747,000	----------
Inspection and grading of fishery products, Bureau of Commereial Fisheries	394,000	394,000	----------
Contributed funds, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	58,000	54,000	−4,000
Total, Department of the Interior	90,059,263	61,518,540	−28,540,723

Department of Agriculture—Forest Service: Cooperative Work	21, 500, 000	22, 000, 000	+500, 000
Other agencies:			
National Capital Planning Commission: Contributed funds	577, 000	100, 000	−477, 000
Smithsonian Institution: Canal Zone biological area fund	15, 000	15, 000	
Contributions, Indian health facilities	425, 000	300, 000	−125, 000
Total, other agencies	1, 017, 000	415, 000	−602, 000
Grand total	112, 576, 263	83, 933, 540	−28, 642, 723

[1] Exclusive of Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration.

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January 1962 budget document for 1963. Subject to further revision.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1962 AND THE ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

	Appropriation estimate, 1962	Appropriation estimate, 1963	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Department of the Interior: [1]			
Payments to States (proceeds of sales)	$260,000	$269,000	+$9,000
Payments of royalties to Oklahoma	7,000	10,000	+3,000
Leasing of grazing lands	1,000	1,000	----------
Payments to States (grazing fees)	1,000	1,000	----------
Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, payment to Coos Bay and Douglas Counties, Oreg., in lieu of taxes	100,000	100,000	----------
Oregon and California grant lands, payment to counties	14,455,000	15,500,000	+1,045,000
Payments to States from grazing receipts, public lands	583,000	875,000	+292,000
Mineral Leasing Act, payment to States	38,297,000	42,000,000	+3,703,000
Expenses, sale of timber, etc., on reclamation land	2,000	2,000	----------
Payments due counties, national grasslands, Bureau of Land Management	215,000	215,000	----------
Expenses, Public Land Administration Act	500,000	500,000	----------
Claim and treaty obligations, Indian Affairs	140,000	161,000	+21,000

Operation and maintenance, revenue, Indian irrigation systems	2, 679, 300	3, 000, 000	+320, 700
Power revenues, Indian irrigation projects	1, 600, 000	1, 700, 000	+100, 000
Acquisition of lands and loans to Indians in Oklahoma, Act of June 26, 1936	10, 000	10, 000	----------
Indian arts and crafts fund	200	200	----------
Colorado River Indian Reservation benefits, Southern and Northern reserves	180, 000	180, 000	----------
Education expenses, children of employees, Yellowstone National Park	139, 100	238, 000	+98, 900
Operation, management, and maintenance and demolition of federally-acquired properties, Independence National Historical Park, National Park Service	21, 650	6, 000	−15, 650
Payment to State of Wyoming, in lieu of taxes on lands in Grand Teton National Park, National Park Service	28, 259	28, 000	−259
Payments from proceeds of sale of water, Geological Survey	1, 000	1, 000	----------
Payment to Alaska from Pribilof Islands receipts	536, 809	621, 600	+84, 791
Migratory bird conservation fund	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	----------
Federal aid in wildlife restoration	14, 985, 093	15, 300, 000	+314, 907
Federal aid in fish restoration and management	6, 253, 432	5, 800, 000	−453, 432
Management of national wildlife refuges	1, 490, 519	1, 500, 000	+9, 481
Expenses incident to sale of refuge products	95, 000	108, 377	+13, 377
Payment to counties under Migratory Bird Conservation Act	496, 840	500, 000	+3, 160
Payment to Alaska, Alaska Game Law	1, 000	1, 000	----------

[1] Exclusive of Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for fiscal year 1962 and the estimates for fiscal year 1963—Continued

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

	Appropriation estimate, 1962	Appropriation estimate, 1963	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Department of the Interior—Continued			
Payments due counties, national grasslands, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	$4,000	$4,000	----------
Internal Revenue collections for Virgin Islands, Office of Territories	6,842,000	7,000,000	+$158,000
Total, Department of the Interior	94,925,202	100,632,177	+5,706,975
Department of Agriculture—Forest Service:			
Expenses, brush disposal	9,000,000	9,000,000	----------
Roads and trails for States (10 percent fund)	10,020,000	11,600,000	+1,580,000
Forest fire prevention (Smokey Bear)	20,000	20,000	----------
Restoration of forest lands and improvements	196,000	196,000	----------
Payment to Minnesota (Cook, Lake, and St. Louis Counties)	123,300	123,300	----------
Payments due counties, submarginal land program	425,000	425,000	----------
Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico	99,200	115,000	+15,800
Payments to States, National Forests Fund (25 percent fund)	25,045,000	29,000,000	+3,955,000
Total, Department of Agriculture—Forest Service	44,928,500	50,479,300	+5,550,800
Total, permanent appropriations	139,853,702	151,111,477	+11,257,775

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January, 1962, budget document for 1963. Subject to further revision.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1962, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in bill for 1963	Bill compared with—	
				1962 appropriations	1963 estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT					
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of lands and resources	[1] $33,750,000	$41,552,000	$39,375,000	+$5,625,000	−$2,177,000
Construction	850,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+150,000	
Oregon and California grant lands (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(7,750,000)	(7,750,000)	(7,750,000)		
Range improvements (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(740,000)	(1,045,000)	(1,045,000)	(+305,000)	
Total, Bureau of Land Management	34,600,000	42,552,000	40,375,000	+5,775,000	−2,177,000
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
Education and welfare services	[2] 71,750,000	82,827,000	81,000,000	+9,250,000	−1,827,000
Resources management	29,075,000	34,417,000	34,300,000	+5,225,000	−117,000
Revolving fund for loans	[3] 4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000		
Construction	39,561,000	54,765,000	52,000,000	+12,439,000	−2,765,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 47.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for fiscal year 1962, and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1963—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in bill for 1963	Bill compared with—	
				1962 appropriations	1963 estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT—Continued					
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS—continued					
Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	$16,000,000	$17,000,000	$16,000,000	----------	−$1,000,000
General administrative expenses	3,967,000	4,372,000	4,000,000	+$33,000	−372,000
Liquidation of Klamath and Menominee Agencies	31,000	----------	----------	−31,000	----------
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	164,384,000	197,381,000	191,300,000	+26,916,000	−6,081,000
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	----------	----------
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
Management and protection	[4] 21,811,500	27,240,000	25,425,000	+3,613,500	−1,815,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	17,869,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+2,131,000	----------
Construction	[5] 36,726,000	44,000,000	40,000,000	+3,274,000	−4,000,000
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	30,000,000	30,000,000	29,000,000	−1,000,000	−1,000,000

General administrative expenses	1, 581, 000	2, 100, 000	1, 900, 000	+319, 000	−200, 000
Total, National Park Service	107, 987, 500	123, 340, 000	116, 325, 000	+8, 337, 500	−7, 015, 000
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES					
Administration of territories	[6] 10, 334, 000	[7] 15, 478, 000	13, 768, 000	+3, 434, 000	−1, 710, 000
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	[8] 6, 304, 000	10, 000, 000	6, 600, 000	+296, 000	−3, 400, 000
Alaska public works	([9])				
Total, Office of Territories	16, 638, 000	25, 478, 000	20, 368, 000	+3, 730, 000	−5, 110, 000
Total, Public Land Management	323, 609, 500	388, 751, 000	368, 368, 000	+44, 758, 500	−20, 383, 000
MINERAL RESOURCES					
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
Surveys, investigations, and research	[10] 49, 820, 000	59, 900, 000	56, 100, 000	+6, 280, 000	−3, 800, 000
BUREAU OF MINES					
Conservation and development of mineral resources	24, 800, 000	[11] 27, 000, 000	26, 550, 000	+1, 750, 000	−450, 000
Health and safety	7, 200, 000	[11] 8, 158, 000	8, 158, 000	+958, 000	
Construction	835, 000	1, 000, 000	425, 000	−410, 000	−575, 000
General administrative expenses	1, 290, 000	1, 333, 000	1, 333, 000	+43, 000	
Development and operation of helium properties (borrowing authorization)	(10, 000, 000)	(20, 000, 000)	(6, 000, 000)	(−4, 000, 000)	(−14, 000, 000)
Total, Bureau of Mines	34, 125, 000	37, 491, 000	36, 466, 000	+2, 341, 000	−1, 025, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 47.

Comparative statement of the Appropriations for fiscal year 1962, and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1963—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in bill for 1963	Bill compared with—	
				1962 appropriations	1963 estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
MINERAL RESOURCES—Continued					
OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH					
Salaries and expenses	$1, 000, 000	$2, 000, 000	$2, 000, 000	+$1, 000, 000	----------
OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION					
Salaries and expenses	750, 000	1, 000, 000	750, 000	----------	−$250, 000
Lead and zinc stabilization program	----------	4, 900, 000	2, 450, 000	+2, 450, 000	−2, 450, 000
Total, Office of Minerals Exploration	750, 000	5, 900, 000	3, 200, 000	+2, 450, 000	−2, 700, 000
OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS					
Salaries and expenses	531, 000	[12] 731, 000	531, 000	----------	−200, 000
OFFICE OF MINERALS MOBILIZATION					
Salaries and expenses	----------	[13] 180, 000	----------	----------	−180, 000
Total, Mineral Resources	86, 226, 000	106, 202, 000	98, 297, 000	+12, 071, 000	−7, 905, 000

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE					
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Salaries and expenses	364,000	364,000	364,000		
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES					
Management and investigations of resources	[14] 12,550,000	15,213,000	14,600,000	+2,050,000	−613,000
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program)	300,000	300,000	300,000		
Construction	7,561,000	8,414,000	7,900,000	+339,000	−514,000
Construction of fishing vessels	750,000	750,000	750,000		
General administrative expenses	482,000	616,000	600,000	+118,000	−16,000
Administration of Pribilof Islands (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(1,981,000)	(1,998,000)	(1,998,000)	(+17,000)	
Limitation on administrative expenses, Fisheries loan fund	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)		
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	21,643,000	25,293,000	24,150,000	+2,507,000	−1,143,000
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE					
Management and investigations of resources	23,315,650	[15] 26,572,000	26,500,000	+3,184,350	−72,000
Construction	5,257,500	4,086,000	4,900,000	−357,500	+814,000
Migratory bird conservation account		7,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000	
General administrative expenses	1,071,000	1,331,000	1,250,000	+179,000	−81,000
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	29,644,150	38,989,000	39,650,000	+10,005,850	+661,000
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	51,651,150	64,646,000	64,164,000	+12,512,850	−482,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 47.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for fiscal year 1962, and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1963—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in bill for 1963	Bill compared with—	
				1962 appropriations	1963 estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER					
Salaries and expenses	[16] $5, 255, 000	$7, 700, 000	$7, 600, 000	+$2, 345, 000	−$100, 000
Operation and maintenance	----------	[17] 2, 085, 000	2, 000, 000	+2, 000, 000	−85, 000
Construction, operation, and maintenance	4, 550, 000	----------	----------	−4, 550, 000	----------
Total, Office of Saline Water	9, 805, 000	9, 785, 000	9, 600, 000	−205, 000	−185, 000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR					
Salaries and expenses	3, 492, 000	3, 747, 000	3, 600, 000	+108, 000	−147, 000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses	[18] 3, 385, 000	[19] 3, 568, 000	3, 350, 000	−35, 000	−218, 000
Total, definite appropriations	478, 168, 650	576, 699, 000	547, 379, 000	+69, 210, 350	−29, 320, 000
Total, indefinite appropriations of receipts	10, 471, 000	10, 793, 000	10, 793, 000	+322, 000	----------
Total, borrowing authorizations	10, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	−4, 000, 000	−14, 000, 000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior	498, 639, 650	607, 492, 000	564, 172, 000	+65, 532, 350	−43, 320, 000

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management	128, 000, 000	140, 740, 000	138, 400, 000	+10, 400, 000	−2, 340, 000
Forest research	26, 368, 000	23, 150, 000	22, 975, 000	−3, 393, 000	−175, 000
State and private forestry cooperation	15, 800, 000	15, 800, 000	15, 800, 000	----------	----------
Total, Forest protection and utilization	170, 168, 000	179, 690, 000	177, 175, 000	+7, 007, 000	−2, 515, 000
Forest roads and trails (Liquidation of Contract Authorization)	35, 000, 000	37, 500, 000	37, 500, 000	+2, 500, 000	----------
Access roads	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	----------	−2, 000, 000	−2, 000, 000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Superior National Forest	250, 000	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	+1, 750, 000	----------
Special acts (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(10, 000)	(10, 000)	(10, 000)	----------	----------
Cooperative range improvements (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(700, 000)	(700, 000)	(700, 000)	----------	----------
Assistance to States for tree planting	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	----------	----------
Total, definite appropriations	208, 418, 000	222, 190, 000	217, 675, 000	+9, 257, 000	−4, 515, 000
Total, indefinite appropriations	710, 000	710, 000	710, 000	----------	----------
Total, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture	209, 128, 000	222, 900, 000	218, 385, 000	+9, 257, 000	−4, 515, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 47.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for fiscal year 1962, and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1963—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in bill for 1963	Bill compared with—	
				1962 appropriations	1963 estimate
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued					
FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW					
Salaries and expenses	$70,000	$70,000	$70,000	----------	----------
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses	70,000	80,000	70,000	----------	−$10,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
Indian health activities	53,010,000	55,834,000	55,284,000	+$2,274,000	−550,000
Construction of Indian health activities	8,285,000	9,220,000	8,320,000	+35,000	−900,000
Total, Public Health Service	61,295,000	65,054,000	63,604,000	+2,309,000	−1,450,000
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	280,000	295,000	290,000	+10,000	−5,000
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	525,000	625,000	625,000	+100,000	----------
Salaries and expenses, open space study, National Capital region	----------	65,000	----------	----------	−65,000

Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system	500,000	1,300,000	100,000	−400,000	−1,200,000
Total, National Capital Planning Commission	1,025,000	1,990,000	725,000	−300,000	−1,265,000
National Capital Transportation Agency					
Salaries and expenses	[20] 960,000	4,450,000	3,350,000	+2,390,000	−1,100,000
Land acquisition and construction	[21] 1,000,000	2,000,000	400,000	−600,000	−1,600,000
Total, National Capital Transportation Agency	1,960,000	6,450,000	3,750,000	+1,790,000	−2,700,000
Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission					
Salaries and expenses	550,000	----------	----------	−550,000	----------
Smithsonian Institution					
Salaries and expenses	9,125,000	11,354,000	10,900,000	+1,775,000	−454,000
Additions to the Natural History Building	4,336,000	----------	----------	−4,336,000	----------
Remodeling of Civil Service Commission Building	400,000	5,400,000	----------	−400,000	−5,400,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	----------	950,000	1,275,000	+1,275,000	+325,000
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	1,932,000	2,054,000	2,054,000	+122,000	----------
Total, Smithsonian Institution	15,793,000	19,758,000	14,229,000	−1,564,000	−5,529,000
Transitional Grants to Alaska					
Grants	6,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	−3,000,000	----------

See footnotes at end of table, p. 47.

Compara ive statement of the appropriations for fiscal year 1962, and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1963—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	Recommended in bill for 1963	Bill compared with—	
				1962 appropriations	1963 estimate
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued					
CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION					
Expenses	$100,000	$100,000	$100,000		
Total, definite appropriations	295,561,000	318,987,000	303,513,000	+$7,952,000	−$15,474,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	710,000	710,000	710,000		
Total, title II, related agencies	296,271,000	319,697,000	304,223,000	+7,952,000	−15,474,000
TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION					
Contributions	(22)	185,000			−185,000
Revolving fund	881,000	3,300,000	200,000	−681,000	−3,100,000
Limitation of administrative expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation	(180,000)	(200,000)	(180,000)		(−20,000)
Total, title III, Virgin Islands Corporation	881,000	3,485,000	200,000	−681,000	−3,285,000

Grand total:					
Definite appropriations	774, 610, 650	899, 171, 000	851, 092, 000	+76, 481, 350	−48, 079, 000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	11, 181, 000	11, 503, 000	11, 503, 000	+322, 000	
Borrowing authorizations	10, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	−4, 000, 000	−14, 000, 000
Total	795, 791, 650	930, 674, 000	868, 595, 000	+72, 803, 350	−62, 079, 000

[1] Includes $1,250,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[2] Includes $750,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[3] Appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[4] Includes $25,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[5] Includes $2,250,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[6] Includes $4,500,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[7] Includes budget amendment of $2,579,000 for American Samoa in H. Doc. No. 334.

[8] Includes $200,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[9] Act continues available $108,000 of prior appropriations.

[10] Includes $100,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[11] Reflects transfer in the estimates of $267,000 from "Conservation and development of mineral resources" to "Health and safety."

[12] Includes $200,000 for activities previously carried under "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies," Office of Emergency Planning.

[13] Amount previously carried under "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies," Office of Emergency Planning.

[14] Includes $400,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[15] Includes $35,000 for an activity previously carried under "Grain for migratory waterfowl."

[16] Includes $3,500,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[17] For activities previously carried under "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Office of Saline Water."

[18] Includes $200,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[19] Includes $106,000 for activities previously carried under "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies," Office of Emergency Planning.

[20] Includes $85,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[21] Appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

[22] Appropriation language provides for a grant to the Corporation of $669,000 to be derived by transfer from internal revenue collections appropriated to the Virgin Islands Government.

O

Union Calendar No. 598

87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10802

[Report No. 1446]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 16, 1962

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, $39,375,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of access roads, acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads (other than on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands), and acquisition and construction of buildings and appurtenant facilities, *$1,000,000*, to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such lands; an amount equivalent to 25 per centum of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, to

remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the amount appropriated herein for the purposes of this appropriation on lands administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture: *Provided further,* That the amount appropriated herein for road construction on lands other than those administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further,* That the amount appropriated herein is hereby made a reimbursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase of nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft; purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures; and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Provided,* That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands (other than

expenditures made under the appropriation "Oregon and California grant lands") shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in subsection (c), title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876), of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California land-grant fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 754), of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund": *Provided further,* That appropriations herein made may be expended on a reimbursable basis for (1) surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and (2) protection and leasing of lands and mineral resources for the State of Alaska.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, as range improvements fees under section 3 of said Act, 25 per centum of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of said Act, and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive Order 10787, dated November 6, 1958, to remain available until expended.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

education and welfare services

For expenses necessary to provide education and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission), of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; $81,000,000.

resources management

For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law; $34,300,000.

revolving fund for loans

For payment to the revolving fund for loans, as authorized by section 10 of the Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (25 U.S.C. 470), $4,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; $52,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, and the Act of August 23, 1958 (72 Stat. 834), $16,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices, $4,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for expenses of exhibits; purchase of not to exceed two hundred and twenty passenger motor vehicles (including fifty for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year), of which two hundred shall be for replacement only, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; advance payments for service (including services which may extend beyond the current fiscal year) under contracts executed pursuant to the Act of June 4, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 452), the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), and legislation terminating Federal supervision over certain Indian tribes; purchase of ice for official use of employees; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated $3,000,000 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition, and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of

admission) ; purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel, and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a curator for the Osage Museum, who shall be appointed with the approval of the Osage Tribal Council and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided,* That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary: *Provided, however,* That no part of this appropriation or other tribal funds shall be used for the acqusition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, if such acquisition results in

the property being exempted from local taxation, except as provided for by the Act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 627).

National Park Service

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For expenses necessary for the management and protection of the areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service, including protection of lands in process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail plans and working drawings) and archeological values in river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin); $25,425,000.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service, $20,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451), of buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities under the

jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including the White House; the repair or replacement of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, or storm, or the construction of projects deferred by reason of the use of funds for such purposes; the acquisition of water rights; and not to exceed $8,409,000 for the acquisition of lands, interest therein, improvements, and related personal property; $40,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, $29,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein provided shall be expended for planning or construction on the following: Fort Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, except minor roads and trails; Great Falls Park, Virginia; Daingerfield Island Marina, Virginia; and extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the National Park Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, $1,900,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and thirty-five passenger motor vehicles (of which one hundred and twenty-five are for replacement only), including not to exceed fifty for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and the objects and purposes specified in the Acts of August 8, 1953 (16 U.S.C. 1b–1d), and July 1, 1955 (16 U.S.C. 18f).

Office of Territories

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and for the departmental administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C., secs. 1422, 1431a(c));

salaries of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secretary, the Government Comptroller, and the members of their immediate staffs as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1591, 72 Stat. 1095); compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. secs. 1421d(e), 1431a(c), and 1572e); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1431a(c)); grants to American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the houses of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa; $13,768,000: *Provided,* That the Territorial and local governments herein provided for are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further,* That appropriations available for the administration of Territories may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

For expenses necessary for the Department of the Interior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement ap-

proved by joint resolution of July 18, 1947 (61 Stat. 397), and the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), including the expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and expenses of the Judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of governmental functions; $6,600,000: *Provided,* That the revolving fund for loans to locally owned private trading enterprises shall continue to be available during the fiscal year 1963: *Provided further,* That all financial transactions of the Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 834): *Provided further,* That the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further,* That appropriations available for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary

to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of article 6(2) of the Trusteeship Agreement approved by Congress: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any law, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to receive, during the current fiscal year, from the Department of Agriculture for distribution on the same basis as domestic distribution in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, without exchange of funds, such surplus food commodities as may be available pursuant to section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c) and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1431).

Alaska Railroad

ALASKA RAILROAD REVOLVING FUND

The Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall continue available until expended for the work authorized by law, including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit and development of industries or travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916 (5 U.S.C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided: *Provided*, That no

employee shall be paid an annual salary out of said fund in excess of the salaries prescribed by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS–15, except the general manager of said railroad, one assistant general manager at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for GS–17, and five officers at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for grade GS–16.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Geological Survey

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by law (72 Stat. 837); classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; control the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U.S.C. 715); and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; $56,100,000, of which $8,430,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations: *Provided,* That no part of this

appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed forty-nine passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; purchase of not to exceed one aircraft for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations and observation wells; expenses of U.S. National Committee on Geology and payment of contributions to the International Union on Geologic Sciences; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts.

Bureau of Mines

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; and developing synthetics and substitutes; $26,550,000.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries, and controlling fires in coal deposits, as authorized by law, $8,158,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For the construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, $425,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional offices, $1,333,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; providing transportation services in isolated areas for employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils, and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrangements; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HELIUM PROPERTIES

The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treasury for payment to the helium production fund pursuant to section 12 (a) of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960 to carry out the provisions of the Act and contractual obligations thereunder, including helium purchases, to remain available

without fiscal year limitation, $6,000,000, in addition to amounts heretofore authorized to be borrowed.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development, as authorized by law (74 Stat. 337), $2,000,000, to remain available until expended. of which not to exceed $300,000 shall be available for administration and supervision.

OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to provide a program for the discovery of the minerals reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions, by encouraging exploration for minerals, including administration of contracts entered into prior to June 30, 1958, under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, $750,000, including not to exceed $213,600 for administrative and technical services, to remain available until expended.

LEAD AND ZINC STABILIZATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out a lead and zinc mining stabilization program, including payments to producers, as authorized by the Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766), $2,450,000.

Office of Oil and Gas

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities with respect to oil and gas, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and its products, and natural gas, $531,000.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Commissioner, $364,000.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

management and investigations of resources

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such resources; promotion of education and training of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions related thereto, as authorized by law; $14,600,000.

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

(SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104 (k) of that Act, $300,000, which shall be available to purchase only those currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required for the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, $7,900,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86–516, to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, $750,000.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, including such expenses in the regional offices, $600,000.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a–631q), there are appropriated amounts not to exceed $1,998,000, to be derived from Pribilof Islands fund.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FISHERIES LOAN FUND

During the current fiscal year not to exceed $250,000 of the Fisheries loan fund shall be available for administrative expenses.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and functions related to

wildlife management in California (16 U.S.C. 695–695c); and leasing and management of lands for the protection of the Florida Key deer; $26,500,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, $4,900,000, to remain available until expended.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

For an advance to the Migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, including such expenses in the regional offices, $1,250,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred and seventeen passenger motor vehicles of which ninety-two shall be for replacement only (including fifty for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year); purchase of not to exceed two aircraft; not to exceed $30,000

for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417); rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed $3 per man per day; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed $1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

Office of Saline Water

salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951–1958), authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, to remain available until expended, $7,600,000, of which not to exceed $525,000 shall be avail-

able for administration and coordination during the current fiscal year.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of demonstration plants for the production of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, as authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958a–1958g), $2,000,000, of which not to exceed $175,000 shall be available for administration.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, $3,600,000, and in addition, not to exceed $130,000 may be reimbursed or transferred to this appropriation from other accounts available to the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That hearing officers appointed for Indian probate work need not be appointed pursuant to the Adminstrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), as amended.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), including teletype rentals and service, not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, and purchase of one

passenger motor vehicle (medium sedan at not to exceed $3,000) for replacement only, $3,350,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft or other equipment in con-

nection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title or in the Public Works Appropriations Act, 1963 shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), when authorized by the Secretary, at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, and in total amount not to exceed $175,000; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the

Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131 and D.C. Code 4–204).

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For expenses necessary for forest protection and utilization, as follows:

Forest land management: For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, including the administration, improvement, development, and management of lands under Forest Service administration, fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening such lands and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purposes, control of white pine blister rust and other forest diseases and insects on Federal and non-Federal lands; $138,400,000, of which $5,000,000 for fighting and preventing forest fires and $1,910,000 for insect and disease control shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended,

to the extent necessary under the then existing conditions: *Provided,* That not more than $300,000 may be used for acquisition of land under the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513–519) : *Provided further,* That funds appropriated for "Cooperative range improvements", pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), may be advanced to this appropriation.

Forest research: For forest research at forest and range experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, as authorized by law; $22,975,000.

State and private forestry cooperation: For cooperation with States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in forest tree planting on non-Federal public and private lands, and in forest management and processing, and for advising timberland owners, associations, wood-using industries, and others in the application of forest management principles and processing of forest products, as authorized by law; $15,800,000.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, sections 203 and 205, relating to the construction and maintenance of forest development roads and trails, $37,500,000, to remain available until expended, for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to

authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203: *Provided,* That funds available under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), shall be merged with and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided further,* That not less than the amount made available under the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913, shall be expended under the provisions of such Act.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

For completion of the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 570; 16 U.S.C. 577c–h), as amended, by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be available without regard to the restriction in the proviso in section 1 of that Act.

SPECIAL ACTS

For the acquisition of land in the Cache National Forest, Utah, in accordance with the Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), as amended, $10,000, to be derived from forest receipts as authorized by said Act: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall

be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned.

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests in accordance with section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), to be derived from grazing fees as authorized by said section, $700,000, to remain available until expended.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16 U.S.C. 568e), $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations available to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to exceed one hundred and fifty-two passenger motor vehicles, of which one hundred and thirty-seven shall be for replacement only, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three of which one shall be for replacement only; (b) employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as

amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not to exceed $25,000; (c) uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); (d) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (5 U.S.C. 565a); (e) expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 514); and (f) acquisition of land and interests therein for sites for administrative purposes, pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a).

Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

Funds appropriated under this Act shall not be used for acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513–519, 521), where such land is not within the boundaries of a national forest nor shall these lands or lands authorized for purchase in Sanders County, Montana, be acquired without approval of the local government concerned.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $70,000.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), including payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and Committee meetings of the Commission either within or outside the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the Commission, $70,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), as amended; purchase of not to exceed twenty-six passenger motor vehicles, of which nineteen shall be for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under

regulations approved by the Secretary; and the purposes set forth in sections 301 (with respect to research conducted at facilities financed by this appropriation), 321, 322 (d), 324, and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; $55,284,000.

CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable buildings; purchase of trailers; and provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a); $8,320,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public and for payment in advance for publications available only upon

that basis or available at a reduced price on prepublication orders.

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities.

Indian Claims Commission

salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U.S.C. 70), creating an Indian Claims Commission, $290,000, of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for expenses of travel.

National Capital Planning Commission

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71–71i), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $625,000.

LAND ACQUISITION, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK, PARKWAY, AND PLAYGROUND SYSTEM

For necessary expenses for the National Capital Planning Commission for acquisition of land for the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital, as authorized by the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended, to remain available until expended, $100,000 which shall be available for the purpose of section 1(a) thereof: *Provided,* That not exceeding $50,000 of the funds available for land acquisition purposes shall be used during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses of the Commission (other than payments for land) in connection with land acquisition.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title II of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537), including payment in advance for membership in societies whose publications or services are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $3,350,000.

LAND ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for the National Capital Transportation Agency for acquisition of land for extra-wide me-

dian strips, or interests therein, and for incidental construction, for transit facilities, as authorized by law, $400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such land purchases shall be subject to the advance approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches among the American Indians and the natives of lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United States, independently or in cooperation with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States, and the excavation and preservation of archeological remains; for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; for the administration, construction, and maintenance of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, Canal Zone, under the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1940, as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and

administration of a national air museum as authorized by the Act of August 12, 1946 (20 U.S.C. 77); for expenses of the National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board; including not to exceed $35,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), for other employees; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications; $10,900,000.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

For necessary expenses of planning, construction, remodeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the National Zoological Park, $1,275,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such portion of this amount as may be necessary may be transferred to the District of Columbia (20 U.S.C. 81–84; 75 Stat. 779).

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

For the upkeep and operation of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolu-

tion 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators and uniforms, or allowances therefor for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and not to exceed $15,000 for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper; $2,054,000.

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

For grants to the State of Alaska to assist in accomplishing an orderly transition from Territorial status to statehood and to facilitate the assumption of responsibilities hitherto performed in Alaska by the Federal Government, and for expenses of providing Federal services or facilities in Alaska for an interim period, as authorized by law (73 Stat. 151), $3,000,000.

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), as amended (72 Stat. 1769), $100,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, RELATED AGENCIES

The per diem rate, unless an agency is otherwise limited by law to payment of a lesser per diem, paid from appropriations made available under this title for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), shall not exceed $75.

TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

REVOLVING FUND

For an additional amount for the revolving fund established under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, for advances to the Virgin Islands Corporation, as authorized by law (63 Stat. 350; 72 Stat. 1760), $200,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to it and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be

necessary in carrying out its programs as set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year: *Provided,* That not to exceed $180,000 shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the Corporation, covering the categories set forth in the 1963 budget estimates for such expenses.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963."

Union Calendar No. 598

87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10802

[Report No. 1446]

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

By Mr. KIRWAN

MARCH 16, 1962

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued March 21, 1962
For actions of March 20, 1962
87th-2d, No. 41

CONTENTS

Appropriation.....1	Foreign aid.....19	Public debt.....15
Committeemen.....22	Foreign trade.....8,20	Recreation.....5,17,26
Consumers.....11	Forest Service.....1	Research.....10,27
Cooperatives.....18,25	Forestry.....14,27	Revolving fund.....25
Disaster loans.....23,24	Grain.....13	Small business.....23
Electrification.....16	Marketing.....9	Soil conservation.....2
Farm program.....12	Minerals.....21	Stockpiling.....6,7
Farmer committees.....22	Peace Corps.....4	Taxation.....18
Fisheries.....24	Personnel.....10	Tomatoes.....3

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed Interior appropriation bill (includes Forest Service).

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. R. 10802, the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, including Forest Service. See Digest 39 for items of interest to this Department. pp. 4219-31

   By a vote of 36 to 85, rejected a proposed amendment by Rep. Jensen to reduce the funds available for personnel compensation and benefits by $20,500,000, with Indian Affairs, soil and moisture conservation, and forest firefighting to be exempted from such reduction. pp. 4227-9

2. SOIL CONSERVATION. Rep. Kitchin commended the accomplishments of the soil conservation districts in Arkansas and North Carolina, and inserted H. C. Res. 445, commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of soil conservation districts. p. 4239

3. TOMATOES. The Select Committee on Small Business issued a report on small business problems in the tomato industry (H. Rept. 1471). p. 4242

4. PEACE CORPS. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10700, to authorize increased appropriations for the Peace Corps Act (H. Rept. 1470). p. 4242

5. RECREATION. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported with amendment H. R. 1171, to increase the public benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas through their incidental or secondary use for public recreation (H. Rept. 1473). p. 4242

6. STOCKPILING. Rep. Rielman inserted a series of articles on the stockpiling controversy. pp. 4234-7

SENATE

7. STOCKPILING. Both Houses received from the Office of Emegency Planning a a secret statistical supplement to the stockpile report. pp. 4173, 4242

8. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Gore contended that the proposed foreign trade bill could not be fully effective unless action is taken to repeal the "U. S. preferential tax treatment of income earned abroad." pp. 4177-81

9. MARKETING. Sen. Capehart inserted his letter protesting the current Federal Trade Commission investigation of supermarkets in the Indianapolis, Inc., area. pp. 4192-3

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

10. RESEARCH; PERSONNEL. Extension of remarks of Rep. Michel commending Dr. Allene Jeanes, one of the six honorees at the Federal Women's Award dinner, for her contributions in research, and inserting Secretary Freeman's remarks in presenting the award. p. A2103

11. CONSUMERS. Extension of remarks of Reps. Short and Alger inserting an article, "A Small Cheer for the Consumer," critical of the President's message on consumers. pp. A2104, A2117-8

Extension of remarks of Rep. Rodino inserting an article, "For the Consumer," urging support for the President's program. pp. A2128-9

12. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Meader inserting an article discussing the decline in farms and stating that "last year's decline in the number of farms reflects the continuation of a trend ..." p. A2107

13. GRAIN. Extension of remarks of Rep. Pelly inserting an article, "Muddled Thinking on China," expressing opposition to shipping grain to Red China. p. A2115

14. FORESTS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Gavin inserting an article, "Protector of Forests," commending Chief of the Forest Service, Richard E. McArdle. p. A2119

15. PUBLIC DEBT. Extension of remarks of Reps. Derounian and Alger inserting two articles, "Danger from the Debt," and "No End to Spending?' pp. A2127-8, A2129

16. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Michel inserting an article, "REA Appeals to States in Power Industry Fight." p. A2091

Extension of remarks of Rep. Andersen, Minn., inserting a speech by Clyde T. Ellis, General Manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, "Lead Now From Strength." pp. A2110-3

House, March 29, 1962

as amended (72 Stat. 1712–1713; 74 Stat. 505).

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after the words "permanent residence" insert the following: "pursuant to sections 1(B) and 3 of the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended (72 Stat. 1712–1713; 74 Stat. 505),

On page 1, line 8, after the word "fee." strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further calling of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 41]

Andrews	Dawson	Miller, George P.
Ashley	Fogarty	Moulder
Blatnik	Fulton	Passman
Blitch	Granahan	Pike
Boggs	Grant	Powell
Bonner	Green, Oreg.	Rains
Boykin	Griffiths	Rivers, S.C.
Brewster	Hall	Roberts, Ala.
Buckley	Hansen	Rogers, Tex.
Celler	Harrison, Va.	Rostenkowski
Collier	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Miss.
Conte	Huddleston	Spence
Cook	Jones, Ala.	Tupper
Cooley	Kearns	Waggonner
Dague	Kee	
Davis, Tenn.	May	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eighty-seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10802, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] will be recognized for one-half hour, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] will be recognized for one-half hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as may be necessary.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of years ago I said on the floor of the House that I was embarrassed because I was about the only chairman of a so-called major committee that did not have a billion dollar bill. It was so humiliating to come before the Congress and not have a bill with at least a billion dollars in it. This year I thought we were going to accomplish that. The budget made a request for $930 million and with just one good supplemental, I would have been among the big-time people with a big bill. But, instead we cut it back $62 million so we are not going to make it this year. But give us time and, I repeat, I think we will accomplish what we started out to do.

Mr. Chairman, every dime of the money appropriated in this bill is going to be spent in and on America and its possessions. There is only a difference of $246 million between the money that we spend under this bill and the money that we take in. If all appropriation bills were like that, we could go back to the turn of the century when cosmetics, tobacco, and alcohol were about the only things that brought in the taxes that were needed to run America. You would not have the great tax burden that we have now.

Mr. Chairman, this a good bill. It is one of the few bills that I know of where we are not trying to destroy something but instead are preserving and developing our great national resources. We are trying to build America. I mean that. And we are doing it in this bill.

Let us see the extent of the activities found within this bill. It involves 767 million acres of Federal land as indicated in the following summary:

First. Conservation and administration of 477 million acres of public domain land involving forest, range, mineral, and water resources.

Second. Provision of educational assistance, facilities, and services to over 53,000 Indian children in Federal day and boarding schools; assistance to over 45,000 Indian children in the public schools; welfare and guidance services to 17,000 needy Indians; management and protection of nearly 50 million acres of Indian-owned forest and range lands; construction, operation, and maintenance of 300 irrigation systems serving about 864,000 acres; and maintenance of over 16,000 miles of roads on Indian reservations.

Third. Management, protection, maintenance, and construction of facilities, including 16,000 miles of roads and trails, in 192 National Parks and other areas comprising about 25½ million acres with an estimated 81 million visitors in 1963.

Fourth. Provision under the Geological Survey for topographic surveys and mapping of the United States, of which only about 60 percent of the land area has been mapped; geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping; water resources investigations; and supervision of 234,000 properties leased for oil, gas, and other minerals valued at $1.33 billion.

Fifth. Conservation and development of our mineral resources under the Bureau of Mines, including inspection of 9,000 coal mines.

Sixth. Management and research to conserve and restore fish and wildlife resources for both recreational and commercial use; operation and maintenance of 97 fish hatcheries and 284 National wildlife refuges consisting of more than 28.5 million acres;

Seventh. The management, protection, and development of 186 million acres of land in the National Forests; an estimated sale of 9.7 billion board feet of timber in 1963 with a value of $121 million; provision of recreation facilities for an estimated 115 million visitors; grazing for 6 million livestock; and cooperation with States in fire control, tree planting, and forest management and processing.

That is the gist of what is covered in this bill.

We listen to radio, and take a look at television, read our daily papers, and think we are the greatest country on earth. That is correct, we are. America is the handwork of God. If you took all the rest of the world and rolled it into one it would not compare with this country. No other nation on earth is so blessed as our country.

But we have made many mistakes and there are many things that we should be doing to more adequately take care of our resources and our territories. That is why the increases in this bill are necessary.

AMERICAN SAMOA

I went to the South Pacific last year after I heard all the criticism about our handling of American Samoa. I went down there to see what it was all about. There is much that we must do to help these people, so we have allowed $13,044,000, an increase of $3,438,600 in the 1962 appropriation. The amount allowed, together with $1,100,000 of local revenues, will provide $5,116,550 for operating expenses, an increase of $1,328,930 primarily for health, education, and welfare and $9,027,450 for construction including $2,828,750 for educational facilities, including 20 consolidated village schools; $272,000 for medical facilities; $2,273,850 for utilities; $600,000 for completion of the jet airfield; $943,000 for the road program; $1,869,000 for installation of a TV educational system, and $240,850 for other facilities.

CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN FACILITIES

The committee has allowed $52 million for construction of Indian schools, dormitories, quarters, utilities, and other buildings and irrigation systems, an increase of $12,439,000 in the 1962 appropriation and a decrease of $2,765,000 in the budget request. It is estimated that with the present backlog and the projected increase in school population for 1963 that there will be a total of over 7,500 additional Indian pupils requiring seats by September 1963. The amount allowed will provide school facilities for about 4,000 additional students leaving an estimated out-of-school backlog of about 3,500 to be provided for in subsequent years. The appropriation will also provide for replacement of about 3,600 seats in some of the most hazardous, unsafe, and substandard buildings in the existing Bureau school plants. Considering the unobligated balance of over $21 million under this item as of February 1, 1962, it is believed that the reduction recommended of $2,765,000, or 5 percent, will readily be absorbed through slippage in the 1963 construction program.

LAND ACQUISITION

I am very concerned with the budget request we received for additional land acquisition, especially the $3,864,000 asked to buy inholdings in the parks. We cut this down to $2 million. We all know about the $9 billion mineral stockpile. If we do not use caution there is going to be a scandal, and a dandy, in buying land. We have 766 million acres of Federal land now and we do not know what to do with it. We are land poor. Much of it should be on the tax rolls.

We have 50 miles of Joshua trees in California. Instead of taking 45 miles and selling it and taking the best 5 miles to make a beautiful park, the budget comes in for funds to buy 2,455 acres more of these lands at a cost of $110,000. We disallowed this.

The budget requested $500,000 to buy an additional 25,000 acres in the Everglades National Park, Fla. Yet we already own 1,300,000 acres in this park. We denied this request. The budget estimate also included $1,400,000 to buy more Civil War areas when we already own and maintain 84,000 acres of these lands. We cut this back to $400,000.

LAND OPPOSITE MOUNT VERNON

Finally, there has been considerable interest in the propsal to acquire the land across from Mount Vernon. After detailed review we turned it down and have detailed our reasons beginning on page 10 of the report.

Briefly, the sewage, treatment plant which sparked this whole question and resulted in the last minute authorization last session will now be located over 3 miles from Mount Vernon where it will be obscured from any view from Mount Vernon. This site has been recommended by the Maryland National Capital Parks and Planning Commission.

The land in question is under adequate planning and zoning controls. The Maryland General Assembly last April approved the extension of the regional jurisdiction of the Maryland National Capital Parks and Planning Commission to include this area in question for purposes of planning, zoning, and subdivision control.

The acreage in question is primarily owned by three families which have held the property (totaling 540 acres) for generations. No evidence was given to the committee that these owners planned to dispose of their property or take any action that was not in keeping with the present rural character of this area or would not give satisfactory scenic easements.

Finally, the Maryland National Capital Parks and Planning Commission has recently announced plans to spend $30 million for some 19,000 acres of park land. So they would be the appropriate ones to buy this land if they think it is desirable. The Federal Government now owns and maintains over 39,000 acres of park land in and around Washington and it is time the local people, who enjoy one of the highest per capita incomes in the Nation, begin to assume some of this burden.

So, Mr. Chairman, I tell you this is a good bill. When you stop to think of it, it is going to take in $100 million more in revenues next year, for a total of $622.8 million. This bill largely pays for itself.

I again repeat, this is the greatest country on the face of the earth; it is the hand of God. Where on the face of the globe can you get the climate, the soil, the minerals, the mountains, and the streams all under one flag? Only in America. I am asking you here today to pass this bill, for I believe it is a reasonable price to pay to preserve and develop our national resources. We have reduced the requests by $62 million, or 7 percent, which I believe is all that is warranted if we are to provide for the many essential additional requirements.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to serve on this committee with our good chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KIRWAN], and the other members of the committee. We generally agree, as a whole, on this bill, and I feel that this is a good bill as a whole, but there are some things in the bill that I think should be corrected, and I shall offer an amendment at the proper time to attempt to correct at least one of the mistakes which I think has been made by the committee.

Now, I am also intrigued by what the gentleman from Ohio says about being a little embarrassed because of the fact that he is chairman of the only committee that does not have a billion-dollar bill to bring before the Congress. Well, I am not a bit embarrassed as the ranking minority member of the committee.

In fact, I hope that not only this bill but every appropriation bill will be held down as much as is justified so long as we have a Federal debt and so long as we have almost every year a Federal deficit. No one knows when the breaking point will come, and when our dollar will lose its value.

Mr. Chairman, that time is when America, especially the people on fixed incomes, will suffer.

Mr. Chairman, if we had a balanced budget and we were paying some on our national debt each year, I would not hesitate one minute to vote to appropriate much more than is contained in this bill for America. As the chairman of the subcommittee says, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], this bill is for America and America alone. There are some 30 agencies involved. Most of these agencies deal with our natural resources—soil, minerals, forests, oil, and everything that goes toward the enrichment of this great, blessed land of ours. I am always quite disgusted when I see the budget come up to the Congress with such a small amount of money requested for the conservation of our most priceless natural resource, soil. In this bill, for instance, the Bureau of the Budget cut the request for soil and moisture conservation, it cut the request for the Indian Service, and the Forest Service, which was requested by the agencies, to the end that there are only a few pennies per acre for soil and moisture conservation on our public domain. That borders on the criminal, my friends, because when the topsoil of America is gone, everything we hold dear in America is gone.

Look around the world and you will find that in every nation in this world that is now in the throes of hunger and strife and cold wars and revolution, powerful land barons let the soil waste away, blow away, wash away, erode away, until they can hardly raise beans, and beans can be raised on the thinnest and the poorest soil, as you well know.

Mr. Chairman, about 35 years ago a great American instituted the Soil Conservation Service.

We now have over 2,900 Soil Conservation Districts in America conserving our priceless soil on privately owned land. The private landowners of America spend many dollars an acre to conserve their soil, and it has paid off with big returns for every dollar they spent. But we, the keepers of the public domain, spend only pennies per acre to conserve the soil of our public domain.

Many times we have raised the budget requests of the Department of the Interior both in the Indian Service and the Forest Service, and I am not talking partisan politices. But there are too many pepole in the agencies of Government that administer the laws that the Congress passes who have no conception of the value of our priceless topsoil. I hope some day they will wake up to the fact that when our soil is gone America is gone, and that most of the acres of public land will some day be needed to feed this exploding population of America.

We have reduced this budget request to the tune of $62 million, yet we are $72,803,350 above the 1962 fiscal appropriation.

The report that comes with this bill is, in my opinion, the best explanatory report that I have ever had the privilege of reading. You know the party in power in Congress does most of the writing of the reports, but more credit must be given to the clerks of the committee, Mr. Eugene Wilhelm and Carson Culp for the work that has been done.

As I said, at the proper time I shall offer an amendment to correct a certain part of this bill, namely the part that calls for over 3,000 additional employees over and above what they have at the present time in this Department, the Department of the Interior. They now have over 56,000 employees. This bill if enacted in its present form would bring the personnel of the Department up to 59,537 employees, costing how much, do you think? Multiply that figure by $6,000, which is a little less than the Federal employee cost today on an average, and then consider the floor space, rent, travel pay, per diem pay, and everything else that goes along with the cost of the administration.

But figuring this amount of $6,000, we have a tidy sum of about $360 million or over one-third of the total amount of the bill. I shall have more to say about that when I offer the amendment when we read the bill for amendments.

It is true that we have a revenue coming from different agencies in the bill amounting to $622,800,000 for the fiscal year 1963. That is the amount that is estimated. We had $522,100,000 in 1962. But let me remind you, we have something in the neighborhood of 80 million people visiting our parks and they pay on an average about 7 cents per person to enter these parks and enjoy the facilities there. The concessionaires take in millions upon millions of dollars annually. How much do you think we get in revenue from those concessionaires—less than $600,000 per annum. There is where we should collect more dollars to help out in this great need for money in the Federal Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I might say in the few more minutes I intend to take that I am quite proud of a lot of things this committee has helped the agencies of the Department to do. I am quite proud of the fact that because of the appropriations we have made for the hospitals and medical care for the Indians that tuberculosis among the Indians has been almost completely eradicated. It was a terrible scourge in Alaska. The incidence of tuberculosis among the people up there as compared with the people on the mainland was four times greater. We now have almost completely eradicated tuberculosis in Alaska as well as on the mainland among the Indians.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the record we have made in furnishing funds for the building of schools and the hiring of teachers which has reduced the number of Indian children of school age who were not in school 10 years ago from 20,000 to around 5,000.

I am sure that within the next two years we will have all the Indian children of school age in school. You know Uncle Sam failed to live up to his treaty with the Indians which provided that there should be a school room and a teacher for every 35 children. We failed miserably in living up to that agreement, but gradually the agreement will be lived up to.

There are, of course, many agencies covered by the bill that must have funds to carry on their important functions, and this bill provides I think more than ample money to do a good job for every agency involved.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], is recognized.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 10802, the appropriation bill for fiscal 1963, was carefully considered by the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department and Related Agencies.

The chairman, Mr. KIRWAN and the ranking minority member, Mr. JENSEN have explained the bill, generally speaking. All members of your subcommittee were diligent in their attendance at the hearings and contributed in bringing forth what we think is a good bill.

As usual our genial clerks, Gene Wilhelm and Carson Culp, did a fine job for the subcommittee. As a matter of fact the accompanying Report No. 1446 to H.R. 10802 is evidence of the fine work done by them. It is to my mind the finest report on the Interior appropriations bill that I have seen over the years that I have been on this subcommittee. The hearings are contained in a volume of 1,560 pages and give in detail the amounts requested by the Interior Department bureaus and related agencies and their justifications for them.

As has already been noted the Bureau of the Budget requested for fiscal year 1963, the sum of $930,674,000 which is an increase of $72,803,305 over the current year. The committee recommends $868,595,000 for 1963 or a decrease of $62,079,000 from the budget request—a decrease of 7 percent.

It has also been stated that it is anticipated that there will be derived in Federal revenues from the activities produced by the 1963 Interior and related agencies appropriations, $622,800,000. This is an increase over the 1962 Federal revenues of $100,700,000.

It is quite apparent to me that there are a number of outstanding and important jobs to be done by the Interior Department in the areas of conservation of soil, water, minerals, forests, and human resources.

This is not to say that advances have not been made in previous years; yet there is a great deal more to be done.

Year after year we hear the story of soil conservation and what it means to America and the future generations of the United States. Year after year we legislate and appropriate enormous sums of money for soil and moisture conservation in both the Agriculture and Interior Departments, including the Reclamation Service of the Interior Department. It has done a lot of good, but there is still more to be done in this field.

We are told that "water is liquid gold" in some parts of our country and that it is becoming one of our greatest problems throughout the whole United States. While this is undoubtedly true, the Interior Department and we in Congress are legislating to assist our economy on the one hand, yet on the other hand some of our legislation goes completely counter to that which is intended and this means the loss of money in appropriations, a loss of money to employer and employee in industry and a loss in what we intended to conserve.

I would suggest that more attention and proper coordination by the involved bureaus be given to such projects so as to avoid this waste.

Then we have river compacts intended to develop our river basins and we are about to be confronted—in the East—by clashes of our Army Engineers—civil functions—with our industry in the suggestion that power projects be established to enable the justification for such development.

Here again, on the north and west branches of the Susquehanna River we see one branch of our Government contemplating measures that will affect two of our basic industries—coal mining and our private power facilities. The most recent conflict is the proposed Raystown Dam on the Juniata River—a tributary of the Susquehanna.

The conversion of saline water into potable water is one of the great experiments and research that is being done by our Interior Department. The hope of the committee and the whole country, as a matter of fact, is for an early solution to this problem. If we can get the cost of conversion of saline water into potable and usable water down to a feasible figure this country will have done a wonderful service. We are optimistic and the reports are to the effect that we shall succeed.

The Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines have been doing a commendable job in mapping, water, and mineral research and conservation. The Bureau of Mines is active—as ever—in the health and safety of the men who toil in mines. In the present Bureau of Mines budget there is an allowance for the appraisal of health and safety conditions in noncoal mines.

The committee disallowed a request for the establishment of a new Institute of Water Research in the Geological Survey. It was thought to be desirable to defer this new Institute of Water Research until more complete information is available from a current study being made by a committee under the auspices of the President's Science Adviser and the Federal Council of Science and Technology.

The Bureau of Mines has currently under its supervision the problem of Mine Drainage Water in the anthracite mines. This is one project which enabled the Federal Government by the act of July 15, 1955, 69 Statute 352, 30 United States Code, sections 571 to 576 to cooperate with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in controlling mine water in the anthracite mines in order to conserve our coal reserves, life and property.

The Federal Government authorized $8,500,000 to be matched by Pennsylvania, or a total of $17 million. It therefore conforms with the policy of Congress to conserve natural resources, promote national security, prevent injuries and loss of life and preserve public and private property.

The legislation specifically specified that none of the public funds made available for the program shall be used for operating or maintenance costs.

As of the end of the last year the contracted cost of 25 projects which had been completed was $7,017,555.47 which was shared equally by the Federal and State Governments. It can be seen that there is a little less than $10 million remaining in the mine drainage fund.

It is my hope that most of this fund shall be continued for the purpose that it was intended and not be used for backfilling of voids or strippings—particularly if we are to believe what some authorities are claiming, namely, that the coal industrly is going to make a comeback. I am opposed to the depletion of this fund for purposes other than mine drainage. I certainly do not want to learn of miners being drowned from the impounded mine waters breaking through such as we had on July 9, 1952, when three men were caught and drowned at Centralia, Columbia County, Pa.; and, on November 5, 1953, when two men were drowned at Minersville, Schuylkill County, Pa., and a few years ago when five men lost their lives by drowning at the Cano and Martin Mines, Minersville, Schuylkill County, Pa.

And certainly we can all remember when 12 men were drowned near Wilkes-Barre, Pa., when the Susquehanna River broke through, and whose bodies are still in the mines.

Just why there is a move on now to utilize the balance of the mine drainage fund for other purposes I don't know; especially when it is so vital to use it for its original intention.

The matter of acid mine water, which of necessity is pumped into our rivers and streams is another problem which should be looked into. It should be included in our water—saline water program—because it is causing havoc and death to thousands upon thousands of fish.

Yes, water is one of our greatest problems—scarity, pollution, salinity.

One of the outstanding jobs being done in the conservation area is that being done by the Public Health Service in the Indian Health Activities. The conservation of human lives.

The history of the U.S. Public Health Service since their assignment to this work with the Indian Service shows the remarkable progress made in health and sanitation of that Service.

On pages 1320 to 1325 of the hearings you will find the report and statement of Dr. Shaw, Chief of the Division of Indian Health on "Indian Health Activities." I am sure you will agree that the accomplishments made in the short time of 7 years is quite encouraging.

There is however more work to be done in the Indian Health Activities.

Conservation of lives, whether it be in the Indian Service or the mining industry or any other vocation such as fire-fighting, is to my mind not only a challenge but vital to the welfare of our country.

Most of the Bureaus of the Interior Department received increases over the 1962 fiscal year appropriations although there were some modest cuts in all instances from the budget estimates.

Every branch of the Department of the Interior has an important role to play in our American life—the all-American department—and they are doing a creditable job.

I would therefore urge the adoption of H.R. 10802. It is a good bill and has, generally speaking, the unanimous approval of your subcommittee.

(Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, on page 10 of the report we have the comment from the Appropriations Committee in regard to purchasing of inholdings in the national parks. Now, this is not a problem which can be dismissed quickly, because it is a far-reaching, very important problem. In the first place, so far as the present consideration of this bill is concerned, we should make a definite determination as to whether or not the inholdings are necessary to complete a particular national park complex and, if the land is essential, then there is little point in delaying acquisition while the property values are rising.

But I would call the attention of the House, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that we can, through our legislating, create very serious problems for the future in the matter of inholdings.

Mr. Chairman, may I describe one specific instance in order to illustrate the kind of problem which can arise? Suppose we have an island surrounded by sea water, and the coastal areas would make a very desirable national park, a very beautiful and significant national park. Then through the center of this island there is what might be described a pastoral zone of great beauty. Now, what that amounts to, of course, Mr. Chairman, is a cow pasture. This land is used for dairying. It would be desirable property if the entire island could be purchased as a national park, and if this pastoral zone could be included. But the proposal which we are debating is to exclude that area as a pastoral zone. This is where the problem develops. The landowners who hold this property which is being used for dairying, will be permitted to retain that land so long as they use it for that specific purpose, for the purpose of dairying. If they lose their milk market, or if they desire to change occupations, or in any other way relieve themselves of this land, under the provisions of the kind of legislation we sometimes write, they can sell this land only on condition that it be use for the original purpose. So the Government says, "If you want to sell this land at any time we will purchase it. It is our intent to purchase it in order to make it a part of the park."

If the Appropriations Committee is not going to buy these inholdings, when a dairyman wants to dispose of his land, and nobody else wants it for dairying purposes, what is he to do? He is stuck with that land which he cannot use for another purpose, but which the Government will not purchase. In other words, we have created with the present attitude of the committee—an impossible situation for the people who own this land within the total proposed boundaries of the national park.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. The gentleman is referring, I believe, to a proposed park to be established in California; is that correct?

Mr. KYL. No; that is not correct, Mr. Chairman. One park is being proposed in California which does fit generally the qualifications I have specified, but the same general procedure is employed now in most of the park areas which we are purchasing, such as at Cape Cod.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KYL. Certainly.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Is there any proposal that the gentleman might make to cure this situation? I am sure that those of us who are interested in inholdings and in the establishment of parks would welcome any suggestion that might cope with this. We are just as interested in the deletion of inholdings and dealing fairly with inholdings as is the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentleman would be interested in the fact that I have sought cooperation and I am receiving cooperation from the Park Service in the Department of Interior to provide legislation for the purchase of all inholdings which are necessary for the completion of the parks. It also might interest the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, to note that the gentleman from Iowa would much prefer the creation of a total land area park such as has been suggested by the gentleman in California so that we can act fairly with the people who own property in those areas, and so that we can have a well developed park complex in each instance. I think we are fooling ourselves when we legislate otherwise.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, in recognition of what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL], has just said, I wish to point out that we did leave in this bill $2 million for the purpose of acquiring in-holdings. This was a cut of something less than 50 percent; we cut out $1,864,000. Of course, that still leaves the Park Service in a position to purchase very sizable acreages of inholdings. We object to this in-holding proposition, in any case, as being a chronic ailment, shall we say, of all the parks. We think that the Park Service and the Congress should be more careful about setting up complete entities when a park is established and not have this everrecurring problem of park boundaries with spots of private hold-

ings inside. I do not think the fault is basically that of the Committee on Appropriations but of the Congress and the Park Service in not eliminating this problem in the first place.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. In other words, what the gentleman is saying is that we should avoid creating circumstances of this kind in the future; is that right?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Exactly.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the gentleman that I am not criticizing the Committee on Appropriations for action in this instance; but I am saying that Members should pay more attention when we vote on these park measures so that we do not continually repeat the difficulty which we have.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are in complete agreement.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Would the gentleman agree that there are park proposals or that there may be park proposals where what is designated as an in-holding, a large area, we will say a dairy ranching area, might be appropriate extension of the entire idea of the park and therefore it might be appropriate to include it within the boundaries of the park? The reason for my question is that while it does not go precisely to the point of appropriations, certainly this is a legislative record which will be considered and referred to in future debate on matters of this kind. Therefore, I would like to understand the gentleman perfectly on that score.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think there might be cases in which leaving an in-holding within park boundaries might be justified.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. And appropriate?

Mr. MAGNUSON. And appropriate, perhaps, to the surroundings of the park, but I do not believe that every park we have should present us with this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For construction of access road, acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads (other than on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands), and acquisition and construction of buildings and appurtenant facilities, $1,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment and points of order at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, several of us were locked out, inasmuch as the Committee took only an hour of general debate on this bill. If we relinquish the right to get in here for a little debate, we could be limited to 5 minutes, perhaps.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I made a unanimous-consent request; the matter is up to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I wish the gentleman would let us proceed for a little while and then perhaps ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read.

Mr. KIRWAN. I shall be happy to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] about a question which has come up in correspondence which I have received about the creation of some park lands in Michigan. Is the gentleman able to inform us whether there is anything in this bill which would provide for additional park areas in the upper part of Michigan?

Mr. KIRWAN. There is nothing in the upper part of Michigan provided for in this.

Mr. BETTS. Is there anything for the acquisition of park lands in any part of Michigan?

Mr. KIRWAN. Not that I am aware of.

Mr. BETTS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] following the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BETTS] whether there is anything in this bill that pertains to any proposed park area known as the Dunes in Michigan, whether it be in the Upper or the Lower Peninsula.

Mr. KIRWAN. No.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the members of his committee for an outstanding job on this bill. As the chairman has so ably and forcefully pointed out in his remarks, this is an all-American bill, with all the funds to be spent on America. I know of no better recommendation for any piece of legislation than that.

I want to especially thank the committee for their consideration of items for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I am fortunate to represent the area of southern Illinois where the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge is located. This facility has been of tremendous help to our area in providing economic benefits. The amount allowed by the committee for operation and maintenance at Crab Orchard will allow us to do an effective job of administration. We also deeply appreciate the amount allowed—$410,000—to complete the network of access roads and other improvements at Devil's Kitchen Lake. This new facility will be of great help to our area in providing cottage sites, swimming, camping, fishing, and boating activity. These facilities at Devil's Kitchen will be a boon to our area and at the same time will bring in an additional revenue to the Government, from many sources at the new lake. The Federal Government has invested many millions of dollars in the Crab Orchard refuge, Little Grassy Lake, and Devil's Kitchen Lake and with the small appropriation being made available in this bill will be able to increase substantially the return on this investment, plus making available to all Americans everywhere the scenic, unequalled recreation facilities and industrial potential the area has to offer. Thank you very much.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, as was the case with the only other regular appropriation bill that has come before the House thus far during this session of the Congress, this bill is almost $73 million above the spending for last year. Yes, it is a reduction—as my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], said—it is a reduction in the budget estimate, but the important point is that it is $73 million above the spending for the same general purposes last year. I would like to see one appropriation bill that at least holds spending down to the level of the preceding year in view of the debt, deficit and inflation that we face in this country. I wonder if we are ever going to get a bill before the House that holds spending at least to what it was in the previous year.

I was interested in hearing the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] tell of his visit to a steel mill in Japan. I take it that the gentleman was not climbing any mountains when he was over there; is that correct? The gentleman did not indulge in any mountain climbing when he was there; did he?

Mr. KIRWAN. No. But there is one thing in this bill that I know the gentleman would not overlook which could come out on a point of order, and that is $2,000 for the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GROSS. That would be for representation allowance?

Mr. KIRWAN. When the Post Office bill was up last week, $6,000 was allowed.

Mr. GROSS. There was also $5,000 for the Treasury Department.

Mr. KIRWAN. When the Secretary was in Japan, he had to buy some extra shoes to go mountain climbing. Now he is down in the Virgin Islands and he has to buy extra clothing to go skin diving I hope the gentleman is not going to take this out on a point of order.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman concerning the Secretary of the Interior. But I thought that representation allowances were for something different. I did not know that representation allowances were for the purpose of buying skis, ski shoes, and skin diving outfits. I am learning something every day.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is what our American youth want and he is just showing the way. I hope the gentleman is not going to take that out on a point of order.

Mr. GROSS. I am not going to do that after the House voted $5,000 and $6,000 in the previous bill. I would not deprive the Secretary of the Interior of any of the good things of life.

Mr. KIRWAN. Trying to answer the question the gentleman asked, it will take about $18 million to pay the additional employees. But they are going to take in $100 million. I know the gentleman would sooner see $60 million being paid to employees, if you are going to make $40 million in profits.

Mr. GROSS. That raises a question I wanted to ask the gentleman. Can the gentleman give us some idea, I believe you said in your remarks that either this year or next year we would come within about $200 million of balancing outgo and income as it pertains to this bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. The report tells you very plainly that they had better cut back next year and that they have about gone the limit when it comes to putting on employees.

Mr. GROSS. The committee report says that the activities covered by the bill are forecast to generate $622,800,000 in Federal revenues in the fiscal year 1963 compared with $522,100,000 in 1962 or an increase of $100,700,000 in revenues.

I believe it was the gentleman's statement that in the next fiscal year we would come within about $200 million of balancing the budget insofar as this spending is concerned. Is that correct or approximately correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, in the coming year.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us where all this revenue is coming from?

Mr. KIRWAN. A great deal of money is taken in from the leasing of oil lands and the role of timber; it is coming in by the millions. Pretty nearly every agency in the Department turns money back to the Government.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to have that explanation from the gentleman. I did not realize there was that much revenue coming in. It goes into the general fund of the Treasury, does it not?

Mr. KIRWAN. One thing with which I quarrel is the little amount we get from concessions. The concessionaires took in $48 million last year. But the Federal Government received only $520,000 in franchise fees. We should do something about this as we stated in the report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the salaries in some of these agencies are pretty high? Let me call attention to page 19 of the bill, the Office of Coal Research, salaries and expenses. Then let me call attention to page 115 of the hearings, the table of salaries paid in the Office of Coal Research. The average GS salary in fiscal 1962 listed is $10,287—the average salary.

Mr. KIRWAN. But the Appropriations Committee had nothing to do with that. The Civil Service Commission establishes these grades. We have nothing to do with it on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think an average salary of $10,287 is rather high?

Mr. KIRWAN. To give you my honest opinion I have taken the same view as you on that, but I as chairman of this subcommittee do not set up the salary schedules; the Civil Service Commission sets them up.

Mr. GROSS. On page 757 of the hearings, the lead and zinc stabilization program, the average GS salary is $8,026.

Mr. KIRWAN. Again, all I can say to the gentleman is that I do not set up the salary schedules; the Civil Service Commission sets them up. Neither you nor I can get a job with the Federal Government unless we are under Civil Service.

Mr. GROSS. And does not the gentleman think that there is duplication in the matter of research as between the Bureau of Mines and the work done in the Coal Research organization?

Mr. KIRWAN. I would say to the gentleman that he is 100 percent correct. But the House voted to set up the new organization, not the Appropriations Committee. It was passed here as an act of this Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Then on top of this $10,000-plus average salary—average salary, mind you—in coal research, I find from the hearings that they are going out and hiring consultants and researchers. They are going to research us out of business in Congress.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am not going to argue with the gentleman on that score, but I would like to see what the gentleman said the day it passed the House.

Mr. GROSS. I say to the gentleman now that we are being saturated with researchers and consultants all over this Government. They are being hired in the Defense Department to tell them how to plan war games, to tell them how to repair tanks, to tell them how to repair military trucks, and still we are spending millions of dollars on the Department of Defense yet that Department hires counseling firms to tell the experts on the payrolls how to do their work.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am only trying to defend this bill. I am not debating about the rest of the departments. I said this is a good bill. Any bill that will take in $100 million and you spend only $18 million in salaries is a good bill. For every 5,000 people that go into the parks we put 1 man on to handle them. When you and I run for office and they have a clambake, it takes 25 just to handle the cutlery. This is 1 for 5,000.

Mr. GROSS. On page 7 of the bill you have an item of "Ice." I hope this has no relation to the expenditure of $2,000 on page 25 of the bill for the office of the Secretary.

Let me ask the gentleman another question. How long is the Civil War Centennial Commission going to go on at $100,000 per year? That has been with us for quite a while.

Mr. KIRWAN. I will again tell the gentleman that I am of the same opinion as he is, but it passed the House, and that is what we are mandated to do, to put this $100,000 in. We did not do it, but we have got to provide the money.

Mr. GROSS. Again I find that the average salary of ungraded positions in the Civil War Centennial Commission is $17,738. They are pretty plush too, are they not?

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I refer to the committee report on page 20, where it is evident that the chairman of the committee and other members recognized the need for and my continuing interest in fisheries research. Each year it has been my privilege to appear before the committee to represent my interest in fisheries research and also forestry matters.

I want to take a moment to extend my sincere appreciation to the committee members for the courtesies they have extended me each year and for the consideration which they have given to suggestions that I have submitted to the committee.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, if I may, in connection with the access road construction program, a question.

The deletion of the $2 million, pursuant to the Comptroller General's decision does not mean the committee feels this road program should suffer but merely that it should be placed in another portion of the bill; is that correct?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct. The Comptroller General told us to cut it out.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Is it the feeling that this amount will be appropriated in the proper section of the committee, in order to continue the Access Road Program?

Mr. KIRWAN. We allowed the full amount that is authorized.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. And the $2 million will be in the highway program?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, as the Members of the House are aware, I have attempted many times in recent years, to call their attention to the preservation of our great natural and historical resources in the valley of the Potomac River.

Last summer, this House approved a bill which I introduced without a dissenting vote.

A companion bill, introduced into the Senate by Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, also passed without a dissenting vote.

Our efforts were signed into Public Law 87–362 by President Kennedy.

Members of both parties acclaimed this action to preserve the view from Mount

Vernon, the home of George Washington.

Now we have before us the report of the Committee on Appropriations of the House. This report disallows in toto the authorization of $937,600 to carry out the provisions of Public Law 87–362, passed less than 5 months ago.

The House Appropriations Committee report correctly states the reasons why the Congress passed Public Law 87–362. From that point the committee report appears to try to make these three points:

First. The present plans of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission will not detract from the Mount Vernon view.

Second. Adequate planning and zoning controls now exist.

Third. The cost will be far greater than that estimated when the bill was passed a few months ago.

Before this body votes on this measure, I wish to correct the records on these points, so that the House is voting with true facts at their disposition.

The House Appropriations Committee report cites that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission piously states that it will "refrain from further consideration of a site at Mockley Point." But the report fails to quote the next sentence from the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission publicity release which says:

> The commission believes that a treatment plant can be located at another site on the southern shore of Piscataway Bay.

Nor does the committee read further in the commission's same recent public pronouncement which says:

> The commission will not consider * * * any site which adversely affects the Mount Vernon vista.

Despite this pronouncement the commission testified in the Senate only 10 days ago on the site it now contemplated.

Of course the commission testifies that the two-story structure it will build at the present will be attractive, and that a sewage treatment plant need not be obnoxious. To Sanitary Engineers they are the most beautiful and utilitarian structures in the world.

The House Appropriations Committee report states that the Maryland National Park and Planning Commission has recommended the new location planned by the commission for the sewage disposal plant in the lower valley of Piscataway Creek.

Again the House Appropriations Committee, in an otherwise commendable attempt to save printing costs, has treated this body to a partial quotation. The report referred to states:

> The long range needs of the [Prince Georges] county will be better met by a plant located at Mattawoman Creek in Charles County.

The report continues:

> It would be our preference that a lagoon system be used rather than a disposal plant [at the Piscataway Bay site] with the thought that when a larger plant is ultimately located in Charles County, those sites could be abandoned as disposal plants and the lands used for park and recreation purposes.

A careful reading of the full Maryland National Park and Planning Commission report shows almost the exact opposite of the House Appropriations Committee report citations.

For example, the House Appropriations Committee report states that the area in question is under "adequate planning and zoning controls."

The same Maryland National Park and Planning Commission report has this to say on zoning controls for the area:

> We do not believe that a proper zoning plan can be developed for this area unless and until an estate and farm zone requiring 2- and 5-acre lot sizes are available.

No such classification now exists in Prince Georges or Charles Counties.

Even if such a zone classification did exist, it could not be applied to prevent a sewage plant here, or any place else. Repeated testimony before the Congress last fall showed that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission was not subject to zoning in location of its plant, and that local government in this area has no control and no veto over the location of a sewage plant. As the Members of the House may remember, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission in its majesty did not deign to testify before the House last summer, and refused pointblank to give a commitment to the Senate that it would not proceed to build a treatment plant while we considered the matter further. That is why the law was passed. It was the only way to stop this agency of the State, and was resorted to only after all local remedies had been tried and failed.

The House Appropriations Committee report further states:

> The acreage in question is primarily owned by three families which have held property (totaling 540 acres) for generations.

This is not even a half truth. Public Law 87–362 refers to 1,186 acres of land along the waterfront. One-half is owned by foundations who have offered to donate their holdings to the Government without cost. Despite repeated testimony on these generous gifts, the House Appropriations Committee completely ignores this fact.

In addition, two other major waterfront landowners have told the Department of the Interior since Public Law 87–362 passed that they will donate easements on their property to the Government.

The three cited by the committee in their report are the only waterfront landowners who have objected.

The report states:

> No evidence was given to the House Appropriations Committee that these (the three cited above) plan to dispose of their property or take any action that was not in keeping with the present rural character of this area, or would not give satisfactory scenic easements.

The House Appropriations Committee chose to ignore that the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission testified before them that it is currently planning to acquire one of the three tracts for its sewage disposal plant and has the power of eminent domain to back up its decision. The owners plans have little to do with this impending change.

The House Appropriations Committee is also unaware that despite the fact that these protesting owners did not testify to this point, they have advised the Department of the Interior that they would not give any easement which would in any way restrict their right to develop their lands as they saw fit.

The House Appropriations Committee questions the adequacy of the $937,600 authorized in Public Law 87–362 and questions the $1,600 per acre estimate on the 586 acres proposed for purchase in addition to the over 500 acres which will be donated outright.

This estimate was made by the Department of the Interior. It was based on the sale of a 50-acre farm in the center of the area along the river opposite Mount Vernon. This sale, which took place last summer, was a private sale between a willing seller and an informed buyer, and was at the price of $1,300 per acre, including the house, barns, and other improvements.

Of course, the objecting families cited by the House Appropriations Committee testified that the acquisition price of their land would be much higher, but I believe that courts would hold that the fair market value is established by recent sales. One of the protesting families' representatives testified before the Senate last fall that the price would be much higher. Close questioning by the chairman of the Senate subcommittee failed to elicit any figure at all from the witness.

The House Appropriations Committee, in making this report on the purported inadequacy of the authorization, was apparently unaware that two of the major waterfront landowners have offered to donate easements on their lands to the Federal Government without cost, since Public Law 87–362 has passed. Another major landowner—note to Mr. SAYLOR—this is the Mount Vernon and Marshall Hall Steamboat Co., who operate slot machines at Marshall Hall—offered to donate easements on his waterfront lands before the bill passed. These easement donations, if accepted by Interior, would be deducted from the estimated cost of acquiring the 586 acres.

In addition, the House Appropriations Committee was apparently not aware that testimony given subsequently in the Senate showed that over one-half of the resident landowners in the Moyaone Reserve in the area covered by Public Law 87–362 have signed statements that they will donate visual easements on their property to the Federal Government without charge. The House Appropriations Committee was also unaware that several hundred acres in the Moyaone Reserve area as covered by this bill are under conservation covenants whose provisions already meet the requirements of this bill. Therefore, even where payments for scenic easements were required, the cost would be very small.

Lastly, the House Appropriations Committee makes the point of its policy that acquisition of park lands in this area is the responsibility of local jurisdictions, and suggests that the local planning

commission should acquire the acreage in question "if it is determined desirable or necessary."

This body should be aware that the Interior Committee in considering Public Law 87–362 made very clear in the hearings that this was not a local park bill passed for the local citizens. We, on the committee, recommend this bill unanimously to protect the view from Mount Vernon for the millions of visitors who come to the shrine from all over America and all over the world.

It must not, can not, and will not be considered a local park bill. The support for this legislation and for the proposed appropriation which has come from all corners of the Nation, is not support of a local park bill. It is support for protection of a national shrine. I cannot believe this country is so poor that we cannot afford to protect that shrine, especially in view of the fact that private individuals are contributing such a large share of the cost.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the view from Mount Vernon is one of the most beautiful in America and I believe we should do whatever is necessary to keep it that way.

George Washington chose the site of his mansion with care, and he chose remarkably well.

We are most fortunate that an accident of history permitted the preservation of Washington's view through all of these years, for it is only in recent years that a few interested individuals began consciously to protect the shrine from unsightly developments across the river.

This is one of those rare occasions in America when we have decided to preserve something unspoiled, and have been able to do so, instead of finding that the damage is done and the only possibility, if it is worthwhile, is costly restoration.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the interest of our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], in this project.

Her devotion to Mount Vernon merits the gratitude of all Americans now and for generations to come.

Most recent evidence of Mrs. BOLTON'S interest was her purchase of approximately one-half the acreage on the Maryland shore that must be protected if the view from Mount Vernon is to remain unspoiled. This land was acquired at her personal expense, in an amount approaching three-quarters of a million dollars, to be preserved in its present natural condition.

This gift, together with other land already protected, has the effect of matching dollar for dollar the expense of the U.S. Government or any other agency that will acquire the balance of the land.

I am proud of FRANCES BOLTON. Her loyalty and her generosity mark her as a truly dedicated American. I sincerely hope that her goal, the preservation and protection of one of America's most meaningful and most beautiful shrines, will soon be realized.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss some aspects of this measure briefly, I want to take time to pay tribute to the gentleman from Ohio and the members of his subcommittee who have done the work on this bill. The members of the Appropriations Committee are often "in the middle" between those who think that more should have been appropriated for particular programs and those who think that the budget should have been cut back still further. In spite of this, I think all of us here recognize, and I want to say once again for the record, that they do a tremendous job and do it well. Specific points raised regarding individual programs are not intended to detract from the overall commendation of these gentlemen on the long hours of study of these complex budget items and the decisions they reach on them.

The particular appropriation bill before us this afternoon is one of the most important from the standpoint of my part of the Nation. In my district, we have great timber resources in the national forests and we have vast stretches of public domain land under the management of the Bureau of Land Management. Thus, the budgetary actions of the Congress on the programs of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service have direct and critical impact on the people and the economy of my State and my congressional district. Indeed, it is because of this close relationship between the programs covered in this measure and the growth and well-being of my area that I feel that I can and must continue to impress upon all of my colleagues the importance of moving ahead in the management and development of our land and timber resources. Believe me, I am close to these programs on a day-to-day basis and I know the potential for long-range returns from an adequate program and the losses to everyone that result from too little and too late.

For example, I want to discuss the range management situation on our public lands. Ever since my election to the House, I have been fighting for a dynamic program of rehabilitation and coordinated management which would reverse the tragic downward trend of these priceless land resources. I was pleased that the Kennedy administration recommended substantial increases in funds for this type of work. I am gratified that the Committee has not cut back the President's requests for soil and moisture conservation and for weed control on the Bureau of Land Management lands. This work is not only investment in the truest sense of the term, it is vital conservation work that has too long gone undone or inadequately done.

As many Members are aware, the problem of deteriorating rangeland has become most critical in recent years. It is resulting in losses of our wildlife, in economic dislocation for our livestock industry, and in unutilized potential for outdoor recreational development. As I have consistently argued, what is essential is a dynamic and imaginative program of rehabilitation of our public lands coupled with coordinated management for full multiple use. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this year we have the potential for a major breakthrough in this field. Following much consultation and study, following conferences between the Bureau of Land Management and users, both livestock operators and other users, and with the full recommendation of the Bureau of Land Management's District Advisory Board, Bureau personnel have developed a pilot program to meet the needs for range rehabilitation and management.

Chosen for the pilot program was the Vale Grazing District of Oregon, a vast area of 6½ million acres with three-quarters of the land being Federal range under Bureau of Land Management administration and management. It is an area in which the problem is particularly acute with almost half of the area either already in the lowest category of condition or in a seriously declining state approaching that classification. At the same time, it is an area with tremendous potential, not only for a more dynamic livestock industry but for other public uses. It has unique scenic attractions, including the newest volcanic flows in the Nation and with superlative hunting areas for deer and for upland birds. The program which has been developed is a long-range plan which can serve as a model for similar conservation work on other public domain lands throughout the Nation.

This program was not completed on a detailed planning basis in time for inclusion in the President's budget request nor in time for presentation to the committee. However, together with the Senators from my State, I will be working for full consideration of this program before the Appropriations Committee of the other body. It is expected that we will receive the full support of the administration in our efforts, and I merely want to urge the Members of this body to give it similar consideration in the event that we are successful in securing action to provide funds to begin this vital program.

I want to turn now to the other major agency affected by the measure before us, the Forest Service. Here, I must express regret that the budget requests of the President have been substantially cut back. Two specific cuts are of great concern to me and to my people. First, the committee has reduced the funds for timber sales administration by $800,000, citing "the depressed timber market." Mr. Chairman, I submit that the reason cited is a primary reason for not cutting back on this program. It is clear to many of us that one of the factors involved in the current crucial situation in our lumber economy is the failure of the Forest Service to program and carry out sales on the national forest on an adequate basis. Obviously, this cannot be done unless we, here in Congress, provide adequate funds to do the job. Therefore, I urge strongly that this budget item be reappraised in the light of the need for an increased timber sales program which will be more in accord with the allowable cuts which the Forest Service has established. As I have pointed out again and again, funds appropriated for timber sales are returned and more than returned. Without ade-

quate funds to carry out a sales program, the timber resources of our national forests will suffer and both the revenues of the Forest Service and the people's investment in their standing timber will be reduced.

Similarly, I want to express concern at the deletion of the requested $2 million for the purchase of access roads. While I appreciate the reasoning behind the committee's decision, it seems to me that here again, the critical situation in the lumber industry which the committee has explicitly recognized calls for continuing, at least for another year, the item which has been deleted. As in the case of timber sales management, access road purchase is an item which is repaid in the immediate future. It allows the Forest Service to gain immediate access to timber supplies now unavailable for harvesting. In the absence of such access, this timber and the revenue it represents must be forgone. Moreover, failure to harvest such timber in season can result in its complete loss. It is my understanding that the recommendation of the committee that these appropriations be secured under another authorization will not provide an adequate solution and I urge that this important item also be given continuing study with an eye to its possible inclusion in the final appropriation measure approved by Congress.

Finally, I want to mention briefly the field of forest research. In recent years there has been progress in this area, but more progress is needed if we are to reap the full benefits of our potential timber resources. The Forest Service has proposed construction of research facilities for work in the vital area of range and wildlife habitat research for the Pacific Northwest. These facilities would be located at La Grande, Oreg., where the State board of higher education is providing a site for Forest Service use. The work of the La Grande Laboratory would develop improved techniques and practices for multiple-use of our national forest lands. With increased recognition of the importance of utilizing these lands for wildlife and recreational purposes, as well as for timber and grazing, the provision of such improved techniques becomes ever more vital. Only with them can the various uses of forest lands become more fully compatible and the need is an immediate one. I am advised that the initial investment required for the La Grande facilities is $500,000, and I deeply regret that such an item was not included in the President's budget. I know how reluctant the committee is to recommend appropriations not requested by the administration, but I want to reaffirm my belief that this research item should not be further delayed, and I hope that it, too, will receive further study and sympathetic consideration by the House so that we can move forward at the earliest possible date.

In conclusion, I merely want to stress, as I have so consistently, that these various appropriations for resource management—and that is primarily what we have in this bill—are, in reality, investments which bring great returns, both in actual revenues, as in the case of our timber resources, and in increased value of our heritage of land, wood and water. While many of these program, as I have indicated, are of particular immediate impact in areas such as my own, their dividends flow to all of the people of the United States.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point or to points of order at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order? If not, the Chair will recognize Members to offer amendments.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself briefly to the item for acquisition of forest lands under the Weeks Act.

The budget request for $500,000 has been reduced to $300,000, the amount available during the current fiscal year.

While all of us appreciate that $300,000 is a considerable increase over the amounts available for this purpose in fiscal years 1957 through 1961, many of us had hoped that there could be a continual and gradual increase in the appropriations, year by year, so that the Forest Service could expedite the important work of consolidating acreages in the eastern national forests.

This item is of considerable importance in Ohio where the Wayne National Forest, authorized in 1939 with an area of 1,455,000 acres, now consists of only 107,769 acres in somewhat scattered tracts.

The Wayne National Forest has enormously valuable potentials for timber production, recreation, watershed protection, and public hunting areas.

These potentials cannot be realized unless we acquire blocks of land large enough for sound forest management practices.

To illustrate the importance with which the Forest Service regards Wayne National Forest, $21,000 of the $100,000 available under the Weeks Act in fiscal 1961 was used to purchase 14 tracts containing 1,600 acres.

Timber production in Ohio is a matter of increasing concern. The Wayne National Forest can contribute greatly to Ohio's timber requirements. I think this is of primary importance. The recreational, watershed, and other benefits are also considerable.

Though I have discussed our Ohio problems, there are equally important areas in other eastern and southern national forests which should be acquired for purposes of consolidation and good management as rapidly as other financial requirements permit.

Like many other resource programs, this program was seriously delayed by the war, prices are rising throughout the country, and to the maximum extent possible, we should proceed now to carry out our original purposes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 41, after line 6 insert:

"GENERAL PROVISION

"The amounts appropriated in this Act are hereby reduced by $20,500,000 to be applied against increased funds provided over fiscal year 1962 under such amounts for personnel compensation and benefits: *Provided*, That none of this reduction shall be applied to the activities pertaining to Indian Affairs (including health and Indian claims), soil and moisture conservation, or forest firefighting."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have at the present time fifty-six thousand and some hundred people employed in the agencies in this bill. The budget requested an additional 4,421. The committee reduced that number of employees by 1,230, leaving about 3,191 additional employees over and above what we allowed in fiscal 1962 under which we are operating today.

There are now employed in all of the agencies of Government approximately 2.5 million people at a total cost to the American taxpayer, in round figures, of $16 billion annually. My amendment seeks to reduce the total number of employees requested for agencies in the bill by approximately 3,000.

Now, there is no law or rule or regulation on the statute books which forbids the transfer or moving of personnel within an agency or department of Government to another position than he now holds if such help is needed in one department and not needed in another department or agency or subagency. I am sure there is not a Member of this House that has not been told by employees of the Federal Government that their department or their agency in which they work could get along very nicely with 75 percent; some of them will tell you 50 percent of the present personnel.

Mr. Chairman, I have exempted from my amendment all personnel of the Indian education, Indian health, Indian Claims Commission, and Soil and Moisture Conservation Service programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have exempted those agencies from my amendment because I would be the last person to hurt the progress which the Indians are making today.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the gentleman has exempted the Indian programs from his amendment, but do I understand correctly that the gentleman did not exempt the expenditures, for example, in the administration of American Samoa and trust territories where we have very similar problems with relation to people who are in a bad condition from a health and education standpoint?

Mr. JENSEN. The additional personnel requested for American Samoa is minor in this bill, I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not exempting that provision from his amendment?

Mr. JENSEN. I am not exempting that agency. There are plenty of people already in Government who can be transferred, as I said before, to American Samoa, or to any other agency of Government where needed.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I would be glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if a straight across-the-board cut of 10 percent is the proper way to legislate on a matter of this kind after it has been thoroughly considered by the committee, why not apply it to all agencies? Why does the gentleman make any exemptions from the operation of the 10-percent cut?

Mr. JENSEN. This is not a 10-percent straight cut at all.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield further, it is a cut across the board except for the three agencies which the gentleman is favoring.

Mr. JENSEN. All right; conditions alter cases. That is true in most any matter which one cares to mention.

Mr. GARY. If the gentleman will yield further, conditions may also alter cases as to the parts of the bill which the gentleman is seeking to cut.

Mr. JENSEN. No. I explained to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]—and I know my friend is quite conservative because I have watched him make quite severe cuts, and I have gone along with him on such cuts on the departments which his subcommittee covers—that here we have an opportunity to save over $20 million for the taxpayers of America, and it should be saved.

Mr. Chairman, under leave granted I include in the RECORD at this point pertinent material in support of my amendment:

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. LAURENCE CURTIS, OF MASSACHUSETTS, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1962

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the late Congressman Hatton W. Sumners' indictment of an overgrown Federal bureaucracy made in 1943 deserves rereading today. The forthright title of his address was "American Capacity for Self-Government Is Being Destroyed by Bureaucracy." It was delivered before the Second New England Conference, a semiofficial gathering of representatives of the people and organizations of the New England States, at Boston, Mass., on November 19, 1943, and was printed in the American Bar Association Journal for January 1944. At the time of the address, Mr. Sumners was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. House of Representatives.

"AMERICAN CAPACITY FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT IS BEING DESTROYED BY BUREUCRACY

"(By Hatton W. Sumners)

"I am deeply grateful for the privilege of addressing this gathering of people from the great States which constitute New England. Great is the history of these States; great, the achievement of their people. But we must be convinced that greater than they were, our States must be, and greater our people must be, if we are to preserve free government, and the time is now. That is why I am here. I want to talk to you about it, because you people are the Government. The Government is not in Washington.

"A democracy is an association of private people engaged in the common venture of governing themselves—no king, no hereditary nobility—the people are the Government.

"In our system of government, the States constitute the habitat, and provide the only machinery through which our democracy can function in the discharge of general governmental duties. The Federal organization was never intended to do that job. It cannot do it except as a bureaucracy. After the Revolution, the people wanted one Army, one Navy, one diplomatic corps, one system of coinage, weights and measures, free commerce among themselves, and a relatively small number of other things. So they created the present Federal organization to be their agent, to do for them these few things which these States could not so well do themselves, the States reserving to themselves and their people general governmental duties and powers.

"Bureaucracy reduces States to vassals

"More and more in later years we have been engaged in the perfectly silly undertaking of trying to make this Federal organization function as the general governmental agency of all the peoples. As a result, we have built up at Washington a governmental colossus, a monstrosity utterly beyond human comprehension or democratic control, regardless of which party or group of officials is in power. By the nature of that sort of government, it is inevitable there shall be extravagance, wastefulness, tyranny. It is inevitable that there shall be more and more government by directives, issued by appointed, not elected, personnel working without supervision.

"We have all but reduced the States to the status of governmental vassals. We have gone further and largely dissolved the States by attaching their subdivisions directly to the Federal Treasury through loans and grants. We have made the individual citizens and the businesses in these States directly subject to Federal control by the creation of their financial dependence upon the Federal Treasury. Money which we thought we were getting for nothing we realize now was got by mortgaging the taxpaying power of unborn generations, while at the same time that taxpaying power was also mortgaged to get money to pay the salaries and expenses of the vast army of administrators, directors, and bosses of the people.

"States must regain control of their sources of revenue

"Let us not deceive ourselves. We are now in the initial stages of what will prove to be another of the great battles between concentrated power and democratic government. In this struggle the States must lead. They must regain control over their sources of revenue which the Federal Government has tapped and is using to subjugate the States and their subdivisions by loans and grants from the Federal Treasury. They must reassert and reestablish their sovereignty as responsible agents of general government. They must do this, not only in order to preserve democratic control in matters of general government, but in order that the governmental business of the Federal organization, freed of the business which belongs to the States, can properly take care of the Federal business. That would bring the total of its business within the comprehension of the elected representatives, so that Federal laws may be enacted by the Federal Congress instead of being enacted as directives by an appointed bureaucratic personnel.

"Whoever controls the purse string, controls. No constitutional limitation is effective against that power. It is without limit. We must right about face. We are not only weakening the States, but we are destroying the self-reliance, the courage, the stamina, and the governmental capacity of their people—the most deadly thing that can be done to a democracy. We are doing what the declared enemies of our democracy could not do to the structure of our Government and to the governmental capacity of the people, upon whose capacity to govern our democracy absolutely depends.

"Fortunately for us, we have the States which are not too large for democratic control. They function in the main through smaller units of government. Their chief officers are chosen by the people. They afford the opportunity and provide the machinery for the operation and development of democratic institutions, and the development of the governmental capacity of the people, who are the governors in a democracy.

"No period of concentration of governmental power, of bureaucratic development, of government by edict instead of government by laws, will ever be cited by the historians of the future as a time of democratic progress. Except by conquest, no people privileged to govern themselves ever lost that privilege until they had first lost their capacity for self-government.

"Government cannot do the job for freemen

"Men are not wise enough to guide by their theories the policies of a great democracy. We cannot do this job if we approach it as Democrats and Republicans. We can do it only as patriotic American citizens, determined that this shall remain one place where people have a chance to be free. Then we can do it.

"Progress is slow. Progress is uphill. Progress is difficult. Progress is the road of struggle, but it is the road of strength. Along that road lies the thrill of victory, the fitness to live.

"We have been getting mighty soft in America. We have wanted the easy way, the fast way. We have turned to Uncle Sam. When some difficulties have come to our communities, to the smaller units of government to our States, to challenge us to effort and to reward us with strength for the duties of tomorrow, we have refused the challenge. We have turned our backs upon the opportunity, and have cried out for a supergovernment to come in and do the job for us.

"As a result we not only fail to receive the increased capacity to govern which nature gives as a reward to those who use the capacity already possessed, but we lost capacity. Nature takes from us the capacity which we fail to use. It is the law of life.

"Your ancestors fired shots which were heard around the world. Their duty was to establish democratic government. It is ours to preserve it. Great is our responsibility. Great is our opportunity.

"While our boys are fighting on the battlefields of the world, we must with equal courage, equal patriotism, and equal sacrifice if necessary, reestablish and have for them when they come home, those who do, a democracy worthy of their service and sacrifice. A nation of people, bottle fed and rocked to sleep in the arms of a great Federal bureaucracy, cannot do the job."

[From the Council Bluffs Nonpareil]

BUREAUCRATS NEVER SATISFIED WITH APPROPRIATIONS

No matter how much State legislatures and Congress appropriate it is never enough to satisfy the bureaucrats who compile the requests for more money.

It has been said that Government spending is like feeding a hog. The more he eats, the more he grows. The more he grows the more he eats. It's the nature of the animal.

President Kennedy's programs are eating more taxes than when we were at war.

The President knows this. But, although he promised a balanced budget when he was campaigning in 1960, he keeps asking for more and bigger appropriations. In almost the same breath he asks that the legal debt limit be lifted because the Government cannot pay its bills.

Do you realize how fast the United States is losing its gold reserve? It has fallen to a 22-year low. The $7 billion deficit forecast for the current fiscal year represents more than a third of all the gold we have.

As a matter of fact we wouldn't have any gold left if the nations which have gold balances, and claims for gold, were to demand immediate payment.

Treasury Secretary Dillon has said: "The free convertibility of gold and the dollar is the cornerstone, not only of our military policy, but of the entire international system."

In short, our dollar is the prop which keeps financial chaos from sweeping the free world.

President Kennedy and his New Frontier advisers do not look at it that way. Their viewpoint is like that of the man who says: "Whisky doen't hurt me."

Secretary Dillon has contradicted himself by saying that the deficits are "entirely appropriate." He doesn't say for whom they are appropriate.

In a reckless plunge unparalleled in economic history the New Frontiersmen contend that all this debt and spending shouldn't worry us, because "we owe it to ourselves."

But the British pound had to devalue because the British lost almost all of their gold, and the French franc is worth only an infinitesimal fraction of what it was before World War I. In both instances the countries spent more than they had the money with which to pay.

President Kennedy and his advisers have the idea that if you spend enough it will do some good. That may be true but it is a sure way to go broke, if continued long enough.

If America blows up the whole free world will blow up, Secretary Dillon has said. Then who will pick up the pieces?

Perhaps a man named Khrushchev in Moscow.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill we have already cut 1,230 new permanent positions, or 28 percent of the additional positions requested. We did it the way it should be done—by specifically disallowing the money for each item we felt, after weeks of testimony, could get along with less people.

We cut over $7.5 million in new salaries. However, if we felt we could have cut more and still got the job done, we would have done so. These across-the-board, meat-ax type of amendments are just passing the buck and saying that we do not want to cut anything in particular, but everything in general.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, after our cuts, leaves an increase of 3,191 positions, or 5 percent. The amendment exempts over a third or 37 percent of these increases. But why exempt just these three items—Indians, soil and moisture, and forest fire fighting? They are important, but no more important than the other activities that would be cut.

Mr. Chairman, here is what the amendment eliminates: all new positions for the national parks.

We have already cut 212, allowing only 372 new positions for the national parks. This is less than 2 additional positions for each of the 192 national parks. Just think—we are only putting in two employees in each national park. We cannot authorize new park areas almost every week without providing the employees to take care of them.

Park visitors are up 7 million, or 10 percent, just since 1960, and are expected to go up 2 million more next year to a total of 81 million.

This increase is only 1 additional permanent employee for every 5,000 increase in visitors.

It would wipe out the increase of 321 positions for the Fish and Wildlife Service; we have already cut out 79 positions.

Who is going to operate the new and expanded hatcheries and wildlife refuges everybody wants?

Who is going to handle the new wetlands acquisition program that was authorized here last year? There is $7 million in the bill for land, but there would be nobody to buy it under this amendment.

Who is going to make the new studies on blackbirds, salmon, shellfish, fish pesticide problems, and so forth?

It would wipe out all the jobs needed to administer the new lead-zinc program for small producers, yet it was authorized right here last year.

Every State seems to think we should step up the topographic and geological mapping program of the Geological Survey. The United States is only 60-percent mapped. It would take 15 years to catch up even with the new employees allowed in the bill. But the amendment will wipe out 617 new employees. We have already cut out 183, or 25 percent of the request.

It wipes out all the new employees to expand the saline water program; yet last year we authorized a stepped-up program.

It wipes out the additional employees to get the new office of Coal Research underway. Again, Congress said we need to help the coal industry.

It wipes out any increases for the Forest Service. We have already cut 110, leaving only 365 new employees. This is less than 1 new employee for every 500,000 acres of national forest land that has to be cared for.

They had to take care of 92 million visitors last year and it is expected to go up to 115 million in 1963.

We have serious new insect infestations that have to be controlled. And there is a need to expand forestry research in forest fire protection, forest diseases, and forest products utilization.

Finally, the amendment knocks out all new employees that would help increase the revenues we get from these 766 million acres of Federal lands.

We have serious backlogs in handling the lease and disposal of land, supervision of mineral and oil leases, grazing fees, et cetera. About 350 of the new positions are for this purpose, and I believe it would be shortsighted not to protect the Government's interest and get all the additional revenues we can for the Federal Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is not this the same amendment that was offered in committee last Friday and defeated by a decisive majority?

Mr. KIRWAN. I cannot be sure whether it is the same amendment or not. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] if it is the same amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. It was defeated by a vote of 17 to 12 in full committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be voted down.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, last year—that is calendar year 1961—the Federal Government increased the number of its employees by about 90,000. That is the Government put about 90,000 new people on the Federal payroll in comparison with the previous year. That costs the taxpayers in salary alone about $450 million a year, to say nothing of fringe benefits.

This bill would increase personnel by approximately 3,000 over last year. And the bill last year increased personnel in this Department by 2,000 over the previous year.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there comes a time when we ought to call a halt to this constant increase in Federal personnel. I do not know that I necessarily favor the type of approach that is taken by this amendment. But if this is the only way to cut down on this extraordinary increase of personnel, I am going to vote for the amendment. If the amendment is not agreed to here today, and if this bill is adopted, it will mean that in the course of 2 years—just 2 years mind you—we will be increasing the personnel in the Department of the Interior by 5,000 employees. Now Topsy grew pretty fast, but I submit that is a little too fast for me considering the condition of the Federal Treasury and the astronomical public debt and the deficit financing that we are engaged in and the prospective deficit for next year. I am not one who would be inclined to cripple the essential operations of any agency. But I just do not believe we can justify increasing the personnel in the Department of the Interior, even admitting that that Department performs some very valuable services to the country and to the taxpayers—I just do not believe we can justify increasing their personnel by 5,000 people over a period of just 2 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN), there were—ayes 36, noes 85.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOMINICK: On page 17, line 8, after the semicolon, strike out "$26,550,000" and insert "$26,737,000".

(Mr. DOMINICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this is a very simple amendment, and one which I think is important and which deals with the program of the Bureau of Mines in connection with oil shale research. The purpose of the amendment is to restore the funds amounting to $187,000 which the committee deleted from the request of the Bureau of Mines. These funds represent the sum needed to step up research in order to provide the information which will be required in establishing and conducting an oil shale industry in the United States. The Bureau requested a total of $920,000 to continue the work which it is currently doing and to allow it also to move forward on the discoveries which have been made by previous research. The effect of the deletion of the funds is to deny to the Bureau the means to advance an additional step in order to increase our knowledge and information on the extraction of oil from oil shale.

What are the additional steps to be taken if these funds are provided? The Bureau of Mines report states:

Additional research effort is needed to define kerogen chemically and physically. Kerogen is oil shale's organic component that is converted to oil upon heating; knowledge of the material's makeup is basic to any scientific approach to conversion of oil shale and undoubtedly can provide answers to many practical operating problems.

Also it was stated that with these funds—

A study will be initiated to provide greatly needed guidance to any future oil shale industry in regard to the mechanisms of oil-mist formation in the retorting process. Economic and efficient recovery of the oil product * * * depends upon formation of a fine, stable, oil mist that can be swept rapidly out of the retort without the oil being condensed on shale particles with subsequent degradation and loss.

In addition, the Bureau said:

Increased emphasis is needed to characterize the larger oil shale deposits of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Many potentially important deposits, such as the rather recently located Piceance Creek Basin beds have not been examined in enough detail to provide more than cursory information about such important factors as their overall richness, and pattern of oil yield with depth and geographical location.

These are quotations from the Bureau of Mines testimony. Piceance Creek Basin is located in that part of Colorado which is represented by my colleague, the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Also located in that area of Colorado, at Rifle, are experimental oil shale facilities which are now being maintained on a standby basis at a cost of $100,000 a year. That standby cost is in this appropriation.

If we add this $187,000—and that is all I am asking for—we will be able to pursue additional research and reporting on some of the new oil shale deposits which have been discovered.

It seems to me it is wrong for us when we have the facilities and known deposits, to stand still especially when resources of oil are so badly needed in this country. We have a nation that is constantly increasing its use of oil. We are the most mobile people on the face of the earth, and at the present time we are using up our oil resources faster than we are locating new ones. Our oil shale deposits are one of our most important natural assets, and unless we locate and continue our research on them it strikes me that we are simply not developing a potential source of oil, a natural resource, which may well prove to be vital to the security of this country at a future date.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this small amount of $187,000 be added to this appropriation so that we can go ahead and complete the necessary research on this oil shale development.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I take a back seat to no one in my interest trying to bring about successful oil shale operations in Colorado. May I say that I would have felt a little better had my colleague from the Second District of Colorado come to me and had spoken to me first about this matter which is very important, not only to the States of Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado, but also to the district of the gentleman now speaking.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I owe the gentleman an apology on this. I apologize to the gentleman. But I did not realize this had happened until a half hour before this bill came up. I owe the gentleman an apology and I do apologize.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman. He has always been very fair.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is untimely. The request of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior for the additional money is untimely. As I understand the situation the Bureau of Mines has not been able to justify their request for these moneys in their appearance before the Committee on Appropriations.

There is on foot at the present time, and has been for many months a proposed program between the Department of the Navy in the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior to see whether or not they can arrive at some conclusion as to the operation of the oil-share demonstration plant facility at Rifle, Colo.

As I understand the request for the appropriation of the moneys which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is trying to place in this legislation it will mean the moving of the small retort at Rifle to Laramie. This small retort is very important, as far as the demonstration program is concerned. It is not really a test-tube operation. It is an advance beyond the test-tube operations which are carried on in the research work at Laramie.

There are many people who live in western Colorado who would like to see this facility reactivated. I would too, provided I thought there was any chance of getting value for the money we spend. However, $187,000 is no amount at all when you consider the approximately $19 million which have been spent on this project with all too few answers found to the problems involved.

I suggest that we defeat this amendment for a most insignificant sum of money, and permit the representatives of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior to arrive at their agreement. Then we can present to Congress a proposal for an effective and constructive approach to the whole problem. I feel that when we spend $19 million, or any sizable part of such sum, whether it is in my district, the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or any other district, that we are entitled to get dollar-for-dollar value out of it. We have not got it in this operation, I am sorry to say.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the happy day when we shall start the development of our vast oil shale values. Their wise use has much to offer to our national economy as well as to our national security. They constitute great reservoirs of untold wealth. Further research in laboratories and demonstration plants is vitally needed, and, in my opinion, needed now. But what we need is a real program, not necessarily big for bigness sake, but certainly not so small that its contributions would, without any doubt, be so limited as to be of no real value. Mr. Chairman, I consider that what is proposed in the amendment is of such limited potential that it should not be considered at this time and I ask for the rejection of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I notice a very substantial increase in the appropriation for the National Capital Transportation Agency. I have always wondered why this agency was in this bill rather than under the District of Columbia appropriations.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, Why this increase of $1,790,000 to a total of $3,750,000 for the National Capital Transportation Agency?

Mr. KIRWAN. We cut that agency $2,700,000.

Mr. GROSS. You mean from the budget estimate?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. That is one thing. That was the asking price.

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not know why they are in this bill. The Congress created this agency and act. The Appropriations Committee did not create it. It was created on the floor of the Congress. We cut it $2.7 million.

Mr. GROSS. What is the increase of $1,700,000 for? I have read the hearings, and I find that they, too, are hiring consultants, yet they want an increase in personnel.

Mr. KIRWAN. That is to develop the transit program and report to the Congress in November of this year. I again tell the gentleman I might be of the same opinion as the gentleman who is asking me these questions. But, I did not authorize this agency. I woke up, like the gentleman did, and found it there. The budget wanted $6.4 million. We allowed only $3.7 million. They claim they need many qualified people to make these studies.

Mr. GROSS. Would that account for the fact that they hired $163,000 worth of consultants and researchers?

Mr. KIRWAN. It is not the consultants. They are hiring the best men that they can get hold of. This is not an easy job. The Congress said they have to report back by next November, and they have to do everything to please the will of the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman agree with me that the House of Representatives ought to have all of the figures on appropriations for the District of Columbia brought together in one place so that Congress may know what they are? We have them in this bill and we have them in the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, in many agencies, and they should not be there.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. KIRWAN. But I am not responsible for that.

Mr. GROSS. Since these people are planning transportation, I wonder if I could suggest that some of this money go for use to put men on buses riding shotgun to protect the passengers in the city of Washington. Do you suppose that would be a good use for some of the money?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think I know why this is not in the District of Columbia appropriation, because it covers an area larger than the District. It is defined as the National Capital area. And, as for the need for consultants, I think it is a highly specialized field, making transportation plans, and they need experts and specialists.

Mr. GROSS. It was apparently designed for the District of Columbia, that is, an agency to serve the District of Columbia, but your reports and your hearings indicate that this thing is blossoming out over into Maryland and Virginia and doing the work for those States that they ought to be doing themselves; saddling the taxpayers of the entire country to take care of the work that ought to be done by those States. That is what I am protesting. They asked for $6 million-plus and you gave an increase of $1,750,000, to better than $3,400,000. When is this thing going to stop?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it is going to stop very soon. They are supposed to report back to the Congress in November.

Mr. GROSS. Like the Centennial Commission, it is going to go on and on until somebody gets busy and takes away the funds.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 10802.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

WORD OF PRAISE FOR OUR LAW-ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

(Mr. TOLL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, an incident which occurred in my district last Saturday evening resulted in an immediate investigation by the local police, the FBI, and the Jewish Community Relations Council. A homemade bomb exploded in the entranceway of the Temple Sinai Synagogue in West Oak Lane, which is in my home community. No one was hurt, and there was little damage, although at the time 200 persons were attending a wedding reception in a first floor room and 100 teenagers were attending a dance on the second floor auditorium.

I commend the police commissioner, Albert L. Brown, his associates, the FBI agents and the representatives of the JCRC for their immediate investigation of the incident and the additional efforts which are being made to check on all synagogues and community centers. The comfort which results from such splendid activity on the part of the enforcement agencies and the council is very important to the people of the community. Our enforcement agencies are entitled to praise for their vigilance in protecting life and property, including all religious institutions.

PLIGHT OF THE FOREMEN IN AMERICAN INDUSTRY

(Mr. DULSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to bring further to the attention of this honorable body, the plight of the foremen in American industry.

This vast group of people, through the actions of the adoption and amendments to the various pieces of labor legislation, have been placed in the role of second class citizens, without the right to bargain collectively on matters of interest to them with their respective employers.

Every person in this great Nation of ours has the natural right of association. This right of association is being compromised on the part of the foremen in our industry, by the haunting shadow of fear and intimidation that is ever present to jeopardize their employment security by engaging in organizational activities. I rise before this body today to ask that we remove this cloud of fear hovering over this group of people, by guaranteeing them freedom from reprisal for collective activity, and by requiring that employers bargain with them in good faith on their common interests.

This group does not ask that we legislate any economic benefits for them. It does not ask that we force any of their conditions of employment upon their employers. It merely asks us to free them from the shackles that now bind them to the extent of preventing them from exercising their natural right of association, and the ensuing ability to bargain on equal terms with their employers.

The working men and women of this country, in the not too distant past, were under this same sort of restraint, this same sort of fear, this same sort of reluctance, to unite, for fear of losing their means of livelihood. This fear was lifted by this body by the adoption of the Wagner Act which opened the doors to their right of association under the protection of the guiding hand of the Federal Government, and the guarantee that they would not suffer in the exercising of this right. In this legislation, the foremen of America were excluded by legal definition and administrative interpretation from the umbrella of protection to the worker provided in these laws.

The famed poet, Carl Sandburg, was once asked what he thought was the most despicable word in the English language. He immediately replied "exclusive" and said that his reason for choosing this word was that it shut out the whole world, and no such word

should have that power of definition. And this is the same word that this body used in shutting out this vast group of people from the same benefits and privileges granted to the production, maintenance, and clerical workers in industry.

To attain this equal rights status for the foremen of American industry, I have introduced H.R. 5662 to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act. This bill accomplishes its purpose by the simple expedient of striking out the definition of "supervisor," which in effect deprives them of all of the benefits provided by this law to employees.

This word "employee" is the definition that the foremen group seeks to have applied to its individual members, and upon close examination of the role of supervisors in industry, they are for all intent and purposes, employees of a company.

At one time in American industry the foreman exercised rights bordering on divine rights, encompassing such powers as the right to hire, fire, assign, promote, transfer, discipline, and to make decisions not of a routine or clerical nature on behalf of the company.

The development of the labor movement, and its subsequent collective bargaining agreements, resulted in severe limitations in the exercise of the above powers by management, and in most instances, the remaining powers were delegated to personnel offices, or labor relations personnel operating as a specialized front office function. Today, the foreman in industry is responsible for the immediate, on the job direction of the working forces, to maintain the production rate, and to control the quality of the product.

The policies and procedures used in industry today are developed at the upper echelon level of corporate management, and the foreman is placed in the role of carrying out, or putting into effect these policies and dccisions. He has no power to alter or rescind these policies, and any effect that he may have on this area of policy would be purely suggestivc or advisory.

Because of these limitations on the scope and activities of the foreman in American industry, there can be no due disruption in the balance of power between management and labor, and only good can come from the act of restoring the foreman to his rightful place in our productive system, rather than his present no man's land existence.

Freedom from fear is a definite requirement to the enjoyment of "pursuit of happiness" as outlined in the Declaration of Independence. One hundred and eighty five years have passed since the adoption of the best known and the noblest of American state papers. It is time for us to make the necessary legislative enactments to provide for thc foremen of America these certain inalienable rights to which the laws of nature and natures God entitle them.

You can redeem this honorable obligation to the foremen of America by your support of H.R. 5662.

MASSACHUSETTS HIGHWAY INVESTIGATIONS: REQUEST FOR WITHHOLDING OF CERTAIN FEDERAL MATCHING FUNDS BECAUSE OF CONTRACTOR'S FALSE BILLINGS

(Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. KYL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to call to the attention of the House a matter which came up before our Special Subcommittee on Federal Aid Highways on Thursday last during interrogation of certain witnesses before the committee, at which time the subject matter of possible fraud on the part of a contractor was brought to light, together with certain payments made by that contractor to certain State employees and also information concerning the subcontractor and his paying for a trip to Europe in 1958 for the then resident engineer supervising the particular job involved at State Route 128, Braintree, Mass.

The letter which I have today written to Hon. Rex. M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, is self-explanatory. It also indicates specific and concrete justification for the motion which I made as ranking Republican as the committee closed the right-of-way hearings in Massachusetts for additional Massachusetts investigations into the area of highway construction contracts and consulting engineers. This case, alone, involves the Marinucci Bros. and Mr. U. MacDonald, subcontractor on the Route 128, Braintree, Federal-aid project, and it is estimated involves between $250,000 and $350,000 of false certification and false billing by the contractor on excavation of peat and blackfill with borrow that was not actually accomplished.

The recommended procedure of withholding Federal matching funds, which I propose to Mr. Whitton, has abundant precedent in the Florida hearings where the State took the contractors involved in payola off the bid list and Federal matching funds were withheld until the matter was settled. It appears, in view of Commissioner Jack Ricciardi's position, as testified to before our subcommittee, to the effect that he was unwilling to remove these contractors from the bid list and thus prevent them from bidding on State projects, there remains no alternative, as I announced in public hearing, but to request the Hon. Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads, to advise the State of such withholding action. The purpose of this letter directed to him is to carry through my announced intention to make such a request officially in writing, which I orally announced during the hearings. In order to facilitate putting this withholding into effect the names of the contractors, together with the State employees who received moneys and gratuities from the contractors, and other available pertinent facts, are necessarily included.

The letter follows:

MARCH 20, 1962.

Re withholding of Federal matching funds on contracts for highway construction of Marinucci Bros., and Mr. U. MacDonald.

Hon. REX M. WHITTON,
Federal Highway Administrator,
Bureau of Public Roads,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WHITTON: On Thursday last in your presence, during the Massachusetts hearing of the Special Subcommittee on Federal-Aid Highways of the House Public Works Committee, upon my interrogation of Commissioner Jack Ricciardi and yourself, it was brought out in the record and other information has been called to my attention that to my satisfaction provides sufficient proof to justify the Bureau of Public Roads doing in Massachusetts as it did in Florida, and that is notifying the State that the Federal Government will suspend all Federal matching funds for payments to Marinucci Bros., and/or Mr. U. MacDonald, contractor, relating to any work performed or to be performed by those firms until full restitution has been made and until proper action has been taken and consummated by the State.

The record shows that on State route 128 at Braintree, a Federal-aid project, the prime contractor, Marinucci Bros. of Dorchester, was thc successful bidder in the amount of $6,104,178.25. The record further shows substantial false certification by the contractors in amounts estimated from $250,000 to $350,000 in that certain excavation of peat was not accomplished, and likewise the backfill with borrow was not accomplished; and, therefore, the contractor has obviously falsified his certification in very substantial sums of money.

Commissioner Ricciardi admitted, also, to knowledge that three department of public works employees had received money from Marinucci Bros. in approximate amounts of $25, $250, and $453, those employees being Schwartz, Hayes, and Keville, in the amounts listed respectively. Likewise, a Mr. Molin, resident engineer on the Braintree contract, had his trip to Europe in 1958 paid for by Mr. U. MacDonald, subcontractor on this particular job.

I am certain you are thoroughly familiar with all the facts relating to this matter, including the 241,000 cubic yard peat excavation overrun and the 300,000 cubic yard borrow overrun, as certified by the resident engineer; namely, Mr. Molin, on March 28, 1960, supposedly on the basis that greater depths were encountered than anticipated, that peat was found in areas overlooked in the original plans and due to a cross-section error as it relates to the peat overrun. Regarding the explanation for the ordinary borrow overrun, it was that additional borrow was needed to backfill where peat excavation exceeded estimated depth, that there was an overrun in rock excavation which necessitated replacing 150,000 cubic yards of rock with borrow to obtain properly compounded embankments and that there was an overrun in excavation due to a change in slopes because rock was found at higher elevations than expected. I understand that the excavations and borings by the Bureau and thc State indicate that the peat depths were not substantially greater than originally estimated, and further, that peat in some places was not excavated at all, completely contrary to the overruns for which the State and Federal Government were falsely billed.

As you recall, in certain Florida cases where contractors were found to be making payola to State employees and, in certain limited instances, where there was suspicion of faulty construction, the contractors were suspended from the bidders' list and the Burcau informed the State that it would not participate in any contracts let or to be let until the matter was satisfactorily settled.

87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10802

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 21 (legislative day, MARCH 14), 1962
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, $39,375,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of access roads, acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads (other than on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands), and acquisition and construction of buildings and appurtenant facilities, $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such lands; an amount equivalent to 25 per centum of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, to

remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the amount appropriated herein for the purposes of this appropriation on lands administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture: *Provided further,* That the amount appropriated herein for road construction on lands other than those administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further,* That the amount appropriated herein is hereby made a reimbursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase of nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft; purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures; and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Provided,* That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands (other than

expenditures made under the appropriation "Oregon and California grant lands") shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in subsection (c), title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876), of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California land-grant fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 754), of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund": *Provided further*, That appropriations herein made may be expended on a reimbursable basis for (1) surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and (2) protection and leasing of lands and mineral resources for the State of Alaska.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, as range improvements fees under section 3 of said Act, 25 per centum of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of said Act, and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive Order 10787, dated November 6, 1958, to remain available until expended.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

education and welfare services

For expenses necessary to provide education and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission), of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; $81,000,000.

resources management

For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law; $34,300,000.

revolving fund for loans

For payment to the revolving fund for loans, as authorized by section 10 of the Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (25 U.S.C. 470), $4,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; $52,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, and the Act of August 23, 1958 (72 Stat. 834), $16,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices, $4,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for expenses of exhibits; purchase of not to exceed two hundred and twenty passenger motor vehicles (including fifty for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year), of which two hundred shall be for replacement only, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; advance payments for service (including services which may extend beyond the current fiscal year) under contracts executed pursuant to the Act of June 4, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 452), the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), and legislation terminating Federal supervision over certain Indian tribes; purchase of ice for official use of employees; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated $3,000,000 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition, and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of

admission) ; purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel, and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a curator for the Osage Museum, who shall be appointed with the approval of the Osage Tribal Council and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided,* That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary: *Provided, however,* That no part of this appropriation or other tribal funds shall be used for the acqusition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, if such acquisition results in

the property being exempted from local taxation, except as provided for by the Act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 627).

National Park Service

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For expenses necessary for the management and protection of the areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service, including protection of lands in process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail plans and working drawings) and archeological values in river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin); $25,425,000.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service, $20,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451), of buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities under the

jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including the White House; the repair or replacement of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, or storm, or the construction of projects deferred by reason of the use of funds for such purposes; the acquisition of water rights; and not to exceed $8,409,000 for the acquisition of lands, interest therein, improvements, and related personal property; $40,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, $29,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That none of the funds herein provided shall be expended for planning or construction on the following: Fort Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, except minor roads and trails; Great Falls Park, Virginia; Daingerfield Island Marina, Virginia; and extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the National Park Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, $1,900,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and thirty-five passenger motor vehicles (of which one hundred and twenty-five are for replacement only), including not to exceed fifty for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and the objects and purposes specified in the Acts of August 8, 1953 (16 U.S.C. 1b–1d), and July 1, 1955 (16 U.S.C. 18f).

Office of Territories

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and for the departmental administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C., secs. 1422, 1431a(c));

salaries of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secretary, the Government Comptroller, and the members of their immediate staffs as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1591, 72 Stat. 1095); compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. secs. 1421d(e), 1431a(c), and 1572c); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1431a(c)); grants to American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the houses of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa; $13,768,000: *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments herein provided for are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of Territories may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

For expenses necessary for the Department of the Interior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement ap-

proved by joint resolution of July 18, 1947 (61 Stat. 397), and the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), including the expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and expenses of the Judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of governmental functions; $6,600,000: *Provided*, That the revolving fund for loans to locally owned private trading enterprises shall continue to be available during the fiscal year 1963: *Provided further*, That all financial transactions of the Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 834): *Provided further*, That the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary

to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of article 6(2) of the Trusteeship Agreement approved by Congress: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any law, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to receive, during the current fiscal year, from the Department of Agriculture for distribution on the same basis as domestic distribution in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, without exchange of funds, such surplus food commodities as may be available pursuant to section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c) and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1431).

Alaska Railroad

ALASKA RAILROAD REVOLVING FUND

The Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall continue available until expended for the work authorized by law, including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit and development of industries or travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916 (5 U.S.C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided: *Provided*, That no

employee shall be paid an annual salary out of said fund in excess of the salaries prescribed by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS–15, except the general manager of said railroad, one assistant general manager at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for GS–17, and five officers at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for grade GS–16.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Geological Survey

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by law (72 Stat. 837) ; classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; control the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U.S.C. 715) ; and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; $56,100,000, of which $8,430,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations: *Provided,* That no part of this

appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed forty-nine passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; purchase of not to exceed one aircraft for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations and observation wells; expenses of U.S. National Committee on Geology and payment of contributions to the International Union on Geologic Sciences; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts.

Bureau of Mines

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; and developing synthetics and substitutes; $26,550,000.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries, and controlling fires in coal deposits, as authorized by law, $8,158,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For the construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, $425,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional offices, $1,333,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; providing transportation services in isolated areas for employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils, and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrangements; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided further,* That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HELIUM PROPERTIES

The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treasury for payment to the helium production fund pursuant to section 12 (a) of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960 to carry out the provisions of the Act and contractual obligations thereunder, including helium purchases, to remain available

without fiscal year limitation, $6,000,000, in addition to amounts heretofore authorized to be borrowed.

Office of Coal Research

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development, as authorized by law (74 Stat. 337), $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $300,000 shall be available for administration and supervision.

Office of Minerals Exploration

salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to provide a program for the discovery of the minerals reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions, by encouraging exploration for minerals, including administration of contracts entered into prior to June 30, 1958, under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, $750,000, including not to exceed $213,600 for administrative and technical services, to remain available until expended.

lead and zinc stabilization program

For necessary expenses to carry out a lead and zinc mining stabilization program, including payments to producers, as authorized by the Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766), $2,450,000.

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities with respect to oil and gas, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and its products, and natural gas, $531,000.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Commissioner, $364,000.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such resources; promotion of education and training of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions related thereto, as authorized by law; $14,600,000.

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

(SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104 (k) of that Act, $300,000, which shall be available to purchase only those currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required for the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, $7,900,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86–516, to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, $750,000.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, including such expenses in the regional offices, $600,000.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a–631q), there are appropriated amounts not to exceed $1,998,000, to be derived from Pribilof Islands fund.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FISHERIES LOAN FUND

During the current fiscal year not to exceed $250,000 of the Fisheries loan fund shall be available for administrative expenses.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and functions related to

wildlife management in California (16 U.S.C. 695–695c); and leasing and management of lands for the protection of the Florida Key deer; $26,500,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, $4,900,000, to remain available until expended.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

For an advance to the Migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, including such expenses in the regional offices, $1,250,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred and seventeen passenger motor vehicles of which ninety-two shall be for replacement only (including fifty for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year); purchase of not to exceed two aircraft; not to exceed $30,000

for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417); rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed $3 per man per day; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed $1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

Office of Saline Water

salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951–1958), authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, to remain available until expended, $7,600,000, of which not to exceed $525,000 shall be avail-

able for administration and coordination during the current fiscal year.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of demonstration plants for the production of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, as authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958a–1958g), $2,000,000, of which not to exceed $175,000 shall be available for administration.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, $3,600,000, and in addition, not to exceed $130,000 may be reimbursed or transferred to this appropriation from other accounts available to the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That hearing officers appointed for Indian probate work need not be appointed pursuant to the Adminstrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), as amended.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), including teletype rentals and service, not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, and purchase of one

passenger motor vehicle (medium sedan at not to exceed $3,000) for replacement only, $3,350,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided,* That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: *Provided,* That appropriations made in this title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft or other equipment in con-

nection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided,* That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title or in the Public Works Appropriations Act, 1963 shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), when authorized by the Secretary, at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, and in total amount not to exceed $175,000; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the

Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131 and D.C. Code 4–204).

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For expenses necessary for forest protection and utilization, as follows:

Forest land management: For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, including the administration, improvement, development, and management of lands under Forest Service administration, fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening such lands and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purposes, control of white pine blister rust and other forest diseases and insects on Federal and non-Federal lands; $138,400,000, of which $5,000,000 for fighting and preventing forest fires and $1,910,000 for insect and disease control shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended,

to the extent necessary under the then existing conditions: *Provided*, That not more than $300,000 may be used for acquisition of land under the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513–519) : *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for "Cooperative range improvements", pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), may be advanced to this appropriation.

Forest research: For forest research at forest and range experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, as authorized by law; $22,975,000.

State and private forestry cooperation: For cooperation with States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in forest tree planting on non-Federal public and private lands, and in forest management and processing, and for advising timberland owners, associations, wood-using industries, and others in the application of forest management principles and processing of forest products, as authorized by law; $15,800,000.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, sections 203 and 205, relating to the construction and maintenance of forest development roads and trails, $37,500,000, to remain available until expended, for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to

authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203: *Provided,* That funds available under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), shall be merged with and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided further,* That not less than the amount made available under the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913, shall be expended under the provisions of such Act.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

For completion of the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 570; 16 U.S.C. 577c–h), as amended, by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be available without regard to the restriction in the proviso in section 1 of that Act.

SPECIAL ACTS

For the acquisition of land in the Cache National Forest, Utah, in accordance with the Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), as amended, $10,000, to be derived from forest receipts as authorized by said Act: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall

be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned.

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests in accordance with section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), to be derived from grazing fees as authorized by said section, $700,000, to remain available until expended.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16 U.S.C. 568e), $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations available to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to exceed one hundred and fifty-two passenger motor vehicles, of which one hundred and thirty-seven shall be for replacement only, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three of which one shall be for replacement only; (b) employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as

amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not to exeeed $25,000; (e) uniforms, or allowanees therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); (d) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other publie improvements (5 U.S.C. 565a); (e) expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by seetion 14 of the Aet of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 514); and (f) acquisition of land and interests therein for sites for administrative purposes, pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a).

Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestie produet is available, no part of the funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be expended in the purehase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

Funds appropriated under this Act shall not be used for aequisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Aet approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513–519, 521), where sueh land is not within the boundaries of a national forest nor shall these lands or lands authorized for purchase in Sanders County, Montana, be aequired without approval of the local government eoneerned.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $70,000.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), including payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and Committee meetings of the Commission either within or outside the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the Commission, $70,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), as amended; purchase of not to exceed twenty-six passenger motor vehicles, of which nineteen shall be for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under

regulations approved by the Secretary; and the purposes set forth in sections 301 (with respect to research conducted at facilities financed by this appropriation), 321, 322 (d), 324, and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; $55,284,000.

CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable buildings; purchase of trailers; and provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a); $8,320,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public and for payment in advance for publications available only upon

that basis or available at a reduced price on prepublication orders.

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities.

Indian Claims Commission

salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U.S.C. 70), creating an Indian Claims Commission, $290,000, of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for expenses of travel.

National Capital Planning Commission

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71–71i), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $625,000.

LAND ACQUISITION, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK, PARKWAY, AND PLAYGROUND SYSTEM

For necessary expenses for the National Capital Planning Commission for acquisition of land for the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital, as authorized by the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended, to remain available until expended, $100,000 which shall be available for the purpose of section 1(a) thereof: *Provided,* That not exceeding $50,000 of the funds available for land acquisition purposes shall be used during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses of the Commission (other than payments for land) in connection with land acquisition.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title II of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537), including payment in advance for membership in societies whose publications or services are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $3,350,000.

LAND ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for the National Capital Transportation Agency for acquisition of land for extra-wide me-

dian strips, or interests therein, and for incidental construction, for transit facilities, as authorized by law, $400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such land purchases shall be subject to the advance approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches among the American Indians and the natives of lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United States, independently or in cooperation with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States, and the excavation and preservation of archeological remains; for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; for the administration, construction, and maintenance of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, Canal Zone, under the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1940, as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and

administration of a national air museum as authorized by the Act of August 12, 1946 (20 U.S.C. 77); for expenses of the National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board; including not to exceed $35,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), for other employees; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications; $10,900,000.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

For necessary expenses of planning, construction, remodeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the National Zoological Park, $1,275,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such portion of this amount as may be necessary may be transferred to the District of Columbia (20 U.S.C. 81–84; 75 Stat. 779).

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

For the upkeep and operation of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolu-

tion 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators and uniforms, or allowances therefor for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and not to exceed $15,000 for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper; $2,054,000.

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

For grants to the State of Alaska to assist in accomplishing an orderly transition from Territorial status to statehood and to facilitate the assumption of responsibilities hitherto performed in Alaska by the Federal Government, and for expenses of providing Federal services or facilities in Alaska for an interim period, as authorized by law (73 Stat. 151), $3,000,000.

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), as amended (72 Stat. 1769), $100,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, RELATED AGENCIES

The per diem rate, unless an agency is otherwise limited by law to payment of a lesser per diem, paid from appropriations made available under this title for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), shall not exceed $75.

TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

REVOLVING FUND

For an additional amount for the revolving fund established under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, for advances to the Virgin Islands Corporation, as authorized by law (63 Stat. 350; 72 Stat. 1760), $200,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to it and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be

necessary in carrying out its programs as set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year: *Provided,* That not to exceed $180,000 shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the Corporation, covering the categories set forth in the 1963 budget estimates for such expenses.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963."

Passed the House of Representatives March 20, 1962.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10802

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

MARCH 21 (legislative day, MARCH 14), 1962
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate debated proposal to bar literacy tests in voting.

Satellite Communications Act cleared for floor action by House Rules Committee.

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 6803–6833

Bills Introduced: Four bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3231–3234; and S. Con. Res. 70.

Page 6804

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1316, to improve the land tenure patterns of the Fort Belknap Reservation, with amendments (S. Rept. 1372);

S. 2696, correcting certain land description errors in the act declaring that the U.S. hold in trust public lands for certain Indian tribes (S. Rept. 1373);

S. 2893, declaring that certain U.S. land is held in trust by the U.S. for the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians in Kansas (S. Rept. 1374);

S. 2895, conveying lands of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe to the Little Flower Mission of the St. Cloud Diocese, with amendments (S. Rept. 1375);

S. 1605, to authorize the Federal Power Commission to delegate its functions in certain cases (S. Rept. 1376);

S. 2179, authorizing Secretary of the Interior to amend existing repayment contracts with irrigation districts to provide for block development, with amendments (S. Rept. 1377);

S. 2665, providing for an amendatory contract with the Burley and Minidoka Irrigation Districts, Idaho, with amendments (S. Rept. 1378);

H.R. 8030, authorizing use of funds from disposition of certain lands for the construction of State charitable, educational, penal, or reformatory institutions in the State of Washington (S. Rept. 1379); and

H.R. 9805, to change the name of Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Historic Site (S. Rept. 1380).

Pages 6803–6804

Private Bill—Literacy Tests for Voting: Senate continued to debate the Mansfield-Dirksen amendment as a substitute for the language of H.R. 1361, private bill. The substitute amendment incorporates the provisions of S. 2750, to bar arbitrary literacy tests in Federal elections.

Majority leader announced that the leadership proposes to file a motion for cloture on Monday, May 7, with the expectation that about an hour after the Senate meets on Wednesday, May 9, the motion for cloture will be voted on. If the motion receives a majority, but less than the required two-thirds vote necessary to invoke cloture on the pending issue, the leadership will move to table its own amendment and then vote against tabling. If the vote is preponderantly against tabling, the leadership at a subsequent date will make a second effort to invoke cloture. If the effort again fails then the Senate will proceed to other business.

Pages 6805–6808, 6833–6838, 6841–6850, 6852–6857, 6864–6868

Confirmations: The following nominations were confirmed: 13 civilian; 170 in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service; 2 judicial; and 1 to a U.N. group.

Pages 6868–6869

Program for Wednesday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 7:08 p.m. until noon Wednesday, May 2, when it will continue on H.R. 1361, private bill—literacy tests for voting.

Pages 6833, 6868

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee, in executive session, marked up and approved for full committee consideration with amendments H.R. 10802, fiscal 1963 appropriations for the Department of the Interior, and related agencies.

COAL SLURRY PIPELINE

Committee on Commerce: Committee began hearings on S. 3044, granting the right of eminent domain to

carriers of coal by pipeline, subject to provisions of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act. Witnesses heard were Frank L. Barton, Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation; Thomas Kennedy, United Mine Workers of America; and George H. Love, of Pittsburgh, F. Stillman Elfred, of St. Louis, and A. L. Lynn, of Huntington, W. Va., all of the National Coal Association.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

"CITY OF NEW ORLEANS"

Committee on Commerce: The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee continued its hearings on S. 3115, to admit the ship *City of New Orleans* to American registry, with testimony from Representative Pelly; Tom Crowley, Puget Sound Tug & Barge, San Francisco; Edwin M. Hood, Shipbuilder's Council of America; Edward H. Cox, Director, Bureau of Traffic Safety, Interstate Commerce Commission; Braxton B. Carr, the American Waterways Operators, Inc.; John N. Thurman, Pacific American Steamship Association; Marvin J. Coles, Committee of American Tanker Owners; Leslie Rudy, Alaska Steamship Co.; and Ira L. Ewers, a D.C. attorney.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call.

TAX AMENDMENTS

Committee on Finance: The committee continued its hearings on H.R. 10650, Internal Revenue Act Amendments, receiving testimony from T. Dwight Williams, Arthur Young & Co.; Eric A. Johnston, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., and the Motion Picture Export Association of America, Inc.; Lawrence E. Tryon, Walt Disney Productions; Emil Gould, National Association of Home Builders; E. W. Kuhlman, Caterpillar Tractor Co.; and O. Kenneth Pryor, Price Waterhouse & Co.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

FOREIGN AID

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee continued its executive consideration of S. 2996, proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1962, but did not conclude action thereon, and will continue its consideration tomorrow.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the following:

Without amendment—H.R. 4380, to quiet title and possession to an unconfirmed and located private land claim in Louisiana; H.R. 8030, authorizing use of funds from disposition of certain lands for the construction of State charitable, educational, penal, or reformatory institutions in the State of Washington; H.R. 9805, to change the name of Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Historic Site; H.R. 10098, to authorize the exchange of certain lands at Antietam National Battlefield site; S. 2696, correcting certain land description errors in the act declaring that the U.S. hold in trust public lands for certain Indian tribes; and S. 2893, declaring that certain U.S. land is held in trust by the U.S. for the Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians in Kansas; and

Amended—S. 1485, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain public lands in Idaho; S. 2164, authorizing Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the First World Conference on National Parks; S.J. Res. 60, establishing the sesquicentennial commission for the celebration of the Battle of New Orleans; S. 2665, providing for an amendatory contract with the Burley and Minidoka Irrigation Districts, Idaho; S. 2179, authorizing Secretary of the Interior to amend existing repayment contracts with irrigation districts to provide for block development; S. 1988, providing for the management of the three wildlife refuges in the Tule Lake and Klamath Wildlife Refuges; S.J. Res. 151, authorizing continued delivery of water for the years 1962 and 1963 to lands of the Third Division, Riverton Federal reclamation project, Wyoming; S. 1316, to improve the land tenure patterns of the Fort Belknap Reservation; S. 2895, conveying lands of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe to the Little Flower Mission of the St. Cloud Diocese; and H.R. 10062, to extend the application of certain laws to American Samoa (amended by substituting the language of an amended version of S. 2440, a similar bill).

Committee also approved the following two rehabilitation and betterment proposals: Sunnyside Irrigation District, Sunnyside Division, Yakima project, Washington; and Gem and Ridgeview Irrigation Districts, Owyhee project, Idaho and Oregon.

ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments met in executive session to consider pending amendments relating to the electoral college, but took no action, and recessed subject to call.

NOMINATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee held hearings on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit, with favoring testimony from Senators Javits and Keating. The nominee was present to testify and answer questions on his own behalf.

GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION LABOR STANDARDS

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare: Subcommittee on Labor held and concluded hearings on H.R. 10786, to provide a 40-hour workweek on Government construction contract work, with testimony from Charles Donahue, Solicitor, Department of Labor; C. J.

enactment of legislation to create a commission to study activities and expenditures of Federal agencies in scientific research and development, and stated that until such a study is made "it is my suggestion that the Congress refrain from hasty and ill-considered action such as the imposition of a percentage limitation of indirect costs on research grants." pp. 7605-8

13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced the following legislative program for next week: Tues.: Private Calendar; balance of week: H. R. 10708, to authorize REA to finance communication facilities for transmission of sounds, signals, pictures, etc., as well as voice, H. R. 10594, elimination of penalties on commodities grown on land of certain publicly owned or privately owned nonprofit institutions, and Reorganization Plan No. 2 providing for the establishment of an Office of Science and Technology. p. 7590

14. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 14. p. 7625

SENATE

15. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 10802 (S. Rept. 1490), which includes items for the Forest Service as shown in the table at the end of this Digest. Excerpts from the Committee report are also attached. The bill also includes items for saline water research and the Virgin Islands Corporation. p. 7489

16. FARM PROGRAM. Sens. Williams, Del., and Mundt inserted several items discussing and urging investigation of the Estes cases. pp. 7522-4

Sen. Case, S. Dak., inserted former President Eisenhower's statements at a recent press conference opposing "Authority to regiment all agriculture" and standby authority to accelerate public works programs. pp. 7561-2

17. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Carlson discussed the possible effects of the proposed trade expansion bill on agricultural exports, stated that in "dealing with the Common Market ... we must make certain that our negotiators have American farmers very much in mind as they dicker with the European representatives," and inserted his article in the Farm Journal discussing this matter. pp. 7500-02

18. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Humphrey contended that AID was not sufficiently using the services of personnel in other Federal agencies, particularly this Department, in the foreign aid program, urged greater use of USDA personnel, and stated that in some cases the USDA "may actually be placed in charge of operating specified programs in the field." Also, he urged this Department "to come before the Congress with a recommendation to establish an Assistant Secretary for International Affairs in the Department." pp. 7530-6

19. WHEAT. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 185, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to defer until June 15, 1962, the proclamation of marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1963 wheat crop. Earlier, at the request of Sen. Ellender, the Agriculture and Forestry Committee had been discharged from further consideration of the resolution. p. 7526

20. TRANSPORTATION. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 628, authorizing the President to proclaim a week in May each year as National Transportation Week. This measure will now be sent to the President. p. 7557

Sen. Lausche criticized the President's transportation proposal, stating that it "constitutes discouragement of private enterprise operating our mass transportation systems." pp. 7492-3

21. RURAL MAIL. Sen. Carlson commended and traced the growth of the rural mail service.

22. BUDGET; BANKING. Sen. Carlson inserted a Kansas Bankers Association resolution "opposing a proposed grant of $540,000 from the budget of the Department of Agriculture, which funds are to be set aside for use of the Credit Union National Association." p. 7500

23. CREDIT. Sen. Proxmire inserted the testimony of Under Secretary of Commerce Gudeman before the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee endorsing S. 1740, to require full disclosure of credit charges in lending and credit merchandising. pp. 7508-10

24. MONOPOLIES. Sen. Kefauver inserted a magazine article, "Modern Monopolies and the Public Interest." pp. 7516-9

25. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 14. p. 7574

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

26. RIVER BASIN. Extension of remarks of Rep. Boykin inserting statements describing the development program of the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Associatio pp. A3481-4, A3517-8

27. BUDGET; EXPENDITURES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Younger inserting an article by Maurice Stans, "Fiscal Brinkmanship -- Gambling With Our Future." pp. A3494-5

28. WILDERNESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Younger inserting an article, "A Stronger Wilderness Bill," and stating that he favors a stronger bill "to preserve these wilderness areas and to protect them from invasion by eroding elements of modern civilization." p. A3496

29. FOREIGN TRADE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Betts inserting a statement presented before the House Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 9900, the proposed trade expansion bill. pp. A3506-9

Extension of remarks of Rep. Curtis, Mo., inserting a statement favoring H. R. 9900, but at the same time expressing concern over certain provisions of H. R. 10650, the proposed tax revision bill. p. A3510

30. RAISINS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Hagen commending the members of the Calif. Raisin Advisory Board for the "outstanding advancements which have been accomplished over the years on behalf of the raisin industry." p. A3517

BILLS INTRODUCED

31. FORESTS. H. R. 11691, by Rep. Buckley, H. R. 11693, by Rep. Johnson, Calif., H. R. 11695, by Rep. McFall, and H. R. 11699, by Rep. Pfost, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain an adequate system of roads and trails for the national forests; to Public Works Committee.

32. PERSONNEL. H. R. 11697, by Rep. George P. Miller, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

H. R. 11701, by Rep. Santangelo, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for increases in annuities, eliminate the option with respect to

certain survivor annuities, and provide for interchange of credits between the civil service retirement system and the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

H. R. 11704, by Rep. Glenn, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

33. FOREIGN TRADE. S. 3284, by Sen. Javits, to amend certain provisions of the Anti-dumping Act, 1921; to Finance Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 7489-90

H. R. 11708, by Rep. James C. Davis, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and to provide for the use of that authority so as to expand U. S. exports and to establish the conditions for fair competition between imported articles and articles of domestic production; to Ways and Means Committee.

34. FOREIGN AID. H. R. 11696, by Rep. MacDonald, to provide that the Government of the United States shall furnish no aid of assistance to any foreign nation or citizen thereof in carrying out any activity under which American citizens will be discriminated against; to Foreign Affairs Committee.

35. SUGAR. H. R. 11706, by Rep. Inouye, to amend title 3 of the Sugar Act of 1948 to provide for the establishment of fair and reasonable minimum wage rates for workers employed on sugar farms; to Agriculture Committee.

36. NATIONAL FLOWER. H. J. Res. 715, by Rep. McSween, designating the rose as the national flower of the United States; to House Administration Committee.

36. INVESTIGATION. H. Res. 635, by Rep. Anderson, Ill., and H. Res. 636, by Rep. McVey, to authorize and direct the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture; to Rules Committee.

37. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. S. 3285, by Sen. Javits, to amend section 304 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 7489-90

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS:
May 11: Establishment of wilderness preservation system, H. Interior.
Outdoor recreation resources bill, S. Interior.

oOo

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Senate Committee Bill, 1963, Compared with House Bill, 1963

Item	Appropriations, 1962 a/	Budget Estimates, 1963	House Bill, 1963	Senate Committee Bill, 1963	Change, Senate Committee Bill Compared with House Bill, 1963
ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS:					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management b/	$127,641,000	$140,740,000	$138,400,000	$141,045,000	+$2,645,000
Forest research	26,368,000	23,150,000	22,975,000	25,865,000	+2,890,000
State and private forestry cooperation	15,800,000	15,800,000	15,800,000	16,405,000	+605,000
Total, Forest protection and utilization	169,809,000	179,690,000	177,175,000	183,315,000	+6,140,000
Forest roads and trails	35,000,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	- -
Access roads	2,000,000	2,000,000	- -	2,000,000	+2,000,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Superior National Forest	250,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	- -
Special Acts:					
Cache National Forest	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	- -
Uinta and Wasatch National Forests	- -	- -	- -	20,000	+20,000
Cooperative range improvements	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	- -
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	+500,000
Total, Annual Appropriations	208,769,000	222,900,000	218,385,000	227,045,000	+8,660,000
PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS (Primarily "Payments to States and Territories" and "Roads and Trails for States" payable from national forest receipts c/	44,928,500	50,479,300	50,479,300	50,479,300	- -

a/ Includes all supplemental appropriations to date.
b/ Includes contingency funds to the extent necessary as follows: (1) For emergency forest fire fighting, $5,000,000; and (2) for insect and disease control, $1,910,000.
c/ In addition, prior year balances available.

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE - FOREST SERVICE

Forest Protection and Utilization

"Forest land management. ...The committee recommends an appropriation of $141,045,000 for 'Forest land management,' which includes the full budget estimate. *** In addition the committee has approved $125,000 to initiate acquisition of lands to be added to the Monongahela National Forest, $180,000 to purchase Manistee National Forest lands on the Lake Michigan shore, and $300,000 for forest fire presuppression and protection in Southern California. The recommended amount is $305,000 greater than the budget estimate and $2,645,000 more than the House allowance.

"The committee believes that in expenditure of the $800,000 restored by the Senate for timber sales administration and management full attention should be given to the problems faced by small operators whose operations are confined mainly to Ponderosa pine.

"The House Committee directed that the Forest Service provide the $30,000 requested by the Virgin Islands Corporation for continuing forestry work in the Virgin Islands. However, the Forest Service is not authorized to carry on this work under 'Forest land management' because work under that activity is limited to national forests and lands immediately adjacent thereto. The committee concurs with the House indication that the Forest Service should care for this work in the Virgin Islands and therefore has added $30,000 to the appropriation for 'State and private forestry cooperation.' "

"Forest Research. ...The committee recommends $25,865,000, which is $2,715,000 more than the budget estimate of $23,150,000, for 'Forest research.'

"The committee proposes an increase of $2,890,000 over the House allowance for the following:

Raising the level of the research program at the Hardwood Research Center, Stoneville, Miss----------$50,000
Expanded research program on restoration of strip-mined land in the Appalachian region----------200,000
Expansion of study of timber processing and marketing problems in Kentucky---------- 60,000
Initiation of construction of a Watershed Management Laboratory, Tempe, Ariz----------450,000
Construction of a Watershed Management Laboratory at Parsons, W. Va---150,000
Initiation of construction of a Forest Research Laboratory, Alexandria, La----------450,000
Initiation of construction of Forest Recreation and Wildlife Habitat Laboratory, Warren, Pa----------250,000
Construction of a Silviculture Laboratory, Sewanee, Tenn----------200,000
Preliminary planning and engineering for expansion of Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis----------380,000
Initiation of construction of a Watershed and Hydraulics Laboratory, Logan, Utah----------450,000
Establishment of a Pine Management and Insect Control Laboratory, Redding, Calif----------250,000

State and Private Forestry Cooperation

"... The committee recommends $16,405,000 for 'State and private forestry cooperation.' This is $605,000 more than the budget estimate and the House allowance. The committee has added the following amounts to the budget estimate of $15,800,000:

For forestry work in the Virgin Islands----------$30,000
For forest fire control----------500,000
For nursery production and distribution---------- 75,000"

Access Roads

"... The committee recommends $2 million for purchase or condemnation of existing roads or rights-of-way needed to provide access to national forest areas. Even though the Comptroller General has held that the Forest Service may recover from benefiting landowner their proportionate share of the construction cost of roads built under the Federal-Aid Highway Act, the ruling came too late to permit the Forest Service to adjust its proposed road program to eliminate this particular budget request. Furthermore, the amount of Federal-Aid Highway Act funds authorized for forest roads and trails is insufficient for construction required to manage and market the timber resources."

Acquisition Of Lands For National Forests

"The committee recommends an appropriation of $20,000 from receipts of the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests to minimize soil erosion and flood damage. It is estimated that the lands needed to protect this particular area fully can be acquired in a period of 4 or 5 years."

Assistance to States for Tree Planting

"... The committee recommends $1,500,000 for 'Assistance to States for tree planting' under authorization of title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1956. This is $500,000 greater than the amount of the budget estimate and of the House allowance. This fund will permit implementation of a cooperative plan, to which each participating State contributes, of forestation through planting, seeding, or site preparation and natural seeding."

Administrative Provisions

"The committee recommends that the Forest Service have authority to purchase a total of 179 motor vehicles. The 27 vehicles included in this action but denied by the House are for use in those areas where General Services Administration equipment is inadequate and where common carrier facilities are not sufficient to meet the Forest Service program needs."

Virgin Islands Corporation

"...The committee concurs with the action of the House in deleting the budget request of $185,000 as a contribution to the Virgin Islands Corporation. However, elsewhere in this bill the committee has provided $30,000 to enable the Forest Service to carry on the forestry activities which were covered by this budget estimate."

Calendar No. 1450

87TH CONGRESS, 2d Session } SENATE { REPORT No. 1490

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

MAY 10, 1962.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 10802]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

Amount of the bill as passed by the House	$868, 595, 000
Amount of increase recommended by the committee	47, 965, 820
Total of the bill as reported to the Senate	916, 560, 820
Amount of the budget estimates considered	932, 674, 000
Amount of 1962 appropriations, including the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962	795, 791, 650

The bill as reported to the Senate:

Under the budget estimates	16, 113, 180
Over the appropriations for fiscal year 1962	120, 769, 170

Summary of the Bill

The committee considered budget estimates totaling $932,674,000 ($901,171,000 for definite appropriations, $11,503,000 for indefinite appropriations of receipts and $20 million borrowing authority) for the programs and activities for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior—exclusive of the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation—and the following related agencies:

Commission of Fine Arts.
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.
Forest Service (Department of Agriculture).
Indian Claims Commission.
Division of Indian Health (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare).
National Capital Planning Commission.
National Capital Transportation Agency.
Smithsonian Institution.
National Gallery of Art.
Civil War Centennial Commission.
Transitional grants to Alaska.
The Virgin Islands Corporation.

The committee recommends appropriations totaling $916,560,820 ($885,037,820 for definite appropriations, $11,523,000 for indefinite appropriations of receipts and $20 million borrowing authority) for the programs and activities of these agencies. The sum recommended by the committee is a decrease of $16,113,180 under the budget estimates considered, an increase of $47,965,820 over the sums included in the House bill, and an increase of $120,769,170 over the sums appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Personnel

The committee recommends an increase of 3,968 positions over the number available during the current fiscal year for the agencies for which appropriations are made in this bill—453 less than the number requested but 777 more than the number approved by the House of Representatives. The Senate committee concurs with the House committee concerning more effective utilization of personnel by agencies represented in this bill. It is also the desire of this committee that the 1964 estimates contain information regarding a review of personnel requirements and use of available personnel.

Employee Housing

The committee directs that employee housing constructed in the United States with funds provided in this bill be within the standards set forth in the committee report on the fiscal year 1962 bill, except that the limitation is increased to $21,500. The committee believes that by proper planning and negotiation, appropriate employee housing should be acquired well within this limitation, making requests to exceed it virtually unnecessary.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $33,750,000
Budget estimate, 1963	[2] 43,252,000
House allowance	39,375,000
Committee recommendation	41,022,200

[1] Includes $1,250,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[2] Includes $1,700,000 in S. Doc. 88.

The committee recommendation of $41,022,200 includes the following reductions in this estimate:

For forestry, $500,000.

For general administration, $100,000.

The full amount of the budget estimate, $10,835,000, for lease and disposal of land and mineral resources is recommended by the committee. Unless the full amount of these funds is available for the conduct of this activity, the advantages which have been gained from the 18-month moratorium on nonmineral applications could be lost, which would give rise to new backlogs in applications awaiting action.

Also, the committee recommends $500,000 more than the amount requested for cadastral surveys, in view of the desirability of carrying out this work in Alaska, as well as on public lands in other States.

The reduction of $377,000 in funds for travel, supplies and materials, and equipment is restored.

The committee directs that for the Information Office, Bureau of Land Management, there be no more than one each of the following positions:

GS–14—Information officer.

GS–13—Assistant information officer.

GS–11—Technical writer and editor.

GS–7—Technical publications writer and editor.

GS–5—Information clerk.

It is the desire of the committee that these personnel be stationed in the Washington office.

The Department has programed 21 information and publications personnel in Washington and in the field offices at an estimated salary cost of $173,125. The committee has allowed $43,325 for salaries for the personnel designated above, disallowing $129,800 requested for salaries for the other 16 positions.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1962	$850,000
Budget estimate, 1963	[1] 1,300,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,000,000

[1] Includes $300,000 in S. Doc. 88.

The committee recommends $1,000,000 for construction, the same amount as the House allowance and the budget estimate. These funds are to be divided as follows:

Access roads, $725,000.—The budget estimate of $725,000 is approved for roads necessary for the forestry and range management programs, for fire protection and for public use of public lands.

Buildings, $275,000.—$275,000 has been requested and is approved for construction of fire lookout facilities and quarters in the Western States and Alaska.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

(Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1962	$7,750,000
Budget estimate, 1963	7,750,000
House allowance	7,750,000
Committee recommendation	7,750,000

The committee recommends an indefinite appropriation of 25 percent of the gross receipts from sales of timber and other products on the revested Oregon and California railroad grant lands. It is estimated that this amount in fiscal year 1963 will be $7,750,000, which is proposed to be expended as follows: construction and acquisition, $6,200,000; reforestation and improvements, $1,150,000; and operation and maintenance, $400,000.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

(Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1962	$740,000
Budget estimate, 1963	1,045,000
House allowance	1,045,000
Committee recommendation	1,045,000

The committee recommends an indefinite appropriation of receipts from grazing of livestock on public lands and on Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act lands, which it is anticipated will amount to $1,045,000 in fiscal year 1963. This is an increase of $305,000 over fiscal year 1962, accounted for by an anticipated increase in grazing receipts.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $71,750,000
Budget estimate, 1963	82,827,000
House allowance	81,000,000
Committee recommendation	82,827,000

[1] Includes $750,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

The committee recommends $82,827,000, which is $11,077,000 more than the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1962, $1,827,000 more than the House allowance, and the same as the budget estimate.

The amount includes the full estimate for "Expenses of educating Indian children in Federal facilities," since it is the committee's feeling that to reduce the amount below the estimated requirement and to prohibit the filling of 100 positions places the Bureau of Indian Affairs in a disadvantageous position with regard to providing an adequate staff for the Bureau's school system in a timely manner.

The committee has also approved the full amount requested for "Maintaining law and order," inasmuch as to reduce the amount of this estimate will make it impossible for the Bureau to employ necessary probation and parole officers.

The committee urges the Bureau of Indian Affairs to use an adequate portion of their relocation services funds to equip, through additional vocational training for Indian youths and adults, those Indians who so desire to move off the reservation and become fully productive.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1962	$29, 075, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	34, 417, 000
House allowance	34, 300, 000
Committee recommendation	34, 677, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $34,677,000, $260,000 more than the budget estimate. This amount was added by the House of Representatives for increased soil and moisture conservation work.

Of the amount appropriated, $70,000 shall be available for maintenance of roads on the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming.

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $4, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	4, 000, 000
House allowance	4, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	4, 000, 000

[1] In Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

The committee recommends the amount of the budget estimate, $4 million, which is the same as the fiscal year 1962 appropriation. The Revolving Fund for Loans is to help improve economic and social conditions among Indians through the proper development and utilization of their resources.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1962	$39, 561, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	54, 765, 000
House allowance	52, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	55, 550, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $55,550,000 for construction of buildings, utilities, and other needed facilities and for irrigation systems. This amount includes the full budget estimate plus $785,000 added by the House of Representatives for construction of the Laguna Consolidated School in New Mexico; and is $3,550,000 greater than the House allowance. Information furnished to the committee indicates that before the end of fiscal year 1962 essentially all of the construction funds available will have been obligated. The

committee does expect that there will be no undue delay in committing appropriated funds.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION

(Liquidation of contract authorization)

Appropriation, 1962	$16,000,000
Budget estimate, 1963	17,000,000
House allowance	16,000,000
Committee recommendation	17,000,000

The committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate, $17 million, for road construction. A return to the force account method of road construction, which will provide training and employment to Indians, will require additional funds for purchasing supplies and materials and for meeting payrolls.

Of the amount appropriated, $540,000 shall be available for completion of grading and base course required for the Toreva-Winslow Road, Ariz.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$3,967,000
Budget estimate, 1963	4,372,000
House allowance	4,000,000
Committee recommendation	4,350,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $4,350,000, $22,000 less than the budget estimate and $350,000 more than the House allowance. This is an increase of only $383,000 over the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1962. The complete program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including the current recommendation of the committee, has increased $34,007,000 since then.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The committee recommends that the limitation on the total number of motor vehicles which can be purchased be increased to 230, and that the limitation on the purchase of special police-type vehicles be increased from 50 to 71. These increases are necessary in order to carry out an adequate program of law enforcement on Indian reservations.

TRIBAL FUNDS

The committee concurs with the House allowance of $3 million. However, the committee recommends that the bill be amended to exempt judgment funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission or the Court of Claims from advancement by the Secretary of the Interior to Indian tribes. Enactment of this provision will require the Department to seek authorizing legislation to use funds resulting from these judgments.

National Park Service

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $21,811,500
Budget estimate, 1963	27,240,000
House allowance	25,425,000
Committee recommendation	26,034,320

[1] Includes $25,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

The committee recommendation of $26,034,320 will provide for the following program increases included in the amount, $25,425,000, allowed by the House of Representatives:

Management of new areas (includes $15,000 for Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial)	$195,000
Operation of newly constructed facilities	1,225,669
Operations resulting from increased visitor use and longer season	1,114,718
Ranger services and interpretive functions in the Washington and regional offices ($98,015 more than the House allowance)	275,076
Additional park police ($330,000 more than House allowance)	480,000
Positions now financed from land acquisition funds	96,375
Water resources studies	103,450
Archeological investigations and salvage programs	160,800
Concessions management and audit staff	12,470
Employee training program	182,300
Additional communication facilities and conversion of radio systems	127,700
Park information publications	99,590
Employees' compensation fund payments	10,000
Mobile tree crews	48,064
Soil and moisture conservation	93,460
Historic American buildings survey ($78,825 more than House allowance)	210,000
Historic site survey ($55,480 more than House allowance)	200,000

The committee does not recommend the proposed increase of $300,000 in the history and natural history investigation program nor the requested increase of $815,680 for the park and recreation programs. But it is the desire of the committee that within available funds there be accomplished a survey of the proposed national parkway from the Blue Ridge Parkway into the State of Georgia as authorized by Public Law 87–135. In addition, $50,000 has been added to initiate a survey of a scenic parkway in southern Utah and adjoining States in the Colorado River region.

The committee directs that no money be expended for any type of study of the Battle of Gettysburg. It is the opinion of the committee that the many volumes on all aspects of this battle which are contained in the Library of Congress are sufficient.

The committee joins with the House committee in urging the National Park Service to study means of increasing Park Service revenues.

The committee directs that within the funds allowed for archeological investigations, as much as $5,000 be used for an archeological study of the Fort Union National Historic Site, N. Dak. The State of North Dakota is to provide an equal sum for this purpose.

The committee feels that the National Park Service should not be denied the use of funds contained in this bill to transfer its region II headquarters from Omaha, Nebr., to Cheyenne, Wyo., if after the Secretary of the Interior's promised restudy is completed, the advisability of the transfer is confirmed.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1961	$17,869,000
Budget estimate, 1963	20,000,000
House allowance	20,000,000
Committee recommendation	20,000,000

The committee approves the budget estimate and House allowance of $20 million for maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities in the national parks, which include roads and trails, buildings, utilities, and other facilities.

The amount recommended includes the following increases proposed by the National Park Service:

For new parks	$160,000
For wage rate increases	367,000
For new and reconstructed Mission 66 facilities	1,164,300
For better maintenance and operation of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, and other facilities	439,700

The committee concurs with the House of Representatives that $10,000 should be made available to initiate maintenance work at the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $36,726,000
Budget estimate, 1963	44,000,000
House allowance	40,000,000
Committee recommendation	44,526,000

[1] Includes $2,250,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

The committee recommends $44,526,000, which is $7,800,000 more than the appropriation in fiscal year 1962, $4,526,000 more than the House allowance, and $526,000 more than the budget estimate.

Included within the committee recommendation are the following, for which there are House allowances:

Amphitheatre at Carlsbad Caverns, N. Mex	$36,000
Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Ind	125,000
Cape Cod National Seashore, Mass	4,000,000
Minute Man National Historical Park, Mass	1,500,000
Fort Davis National Historic Site, Tex	115,000
Fort Smith National Historic Site, Ark	319,000
Inholdings and extensions of boundaries, various parks (an increase of $1,789,000 over the House allowance). (The committee has included in the bill a prohibition against the condemnation of land for the Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming.)	3,789,000
Camping and picnicking facilities ($2,738,000 greater than the budget estimate)	6,038,000
Acquisition of lands in Civil War areas ($500,000 more than the House allowance). (The committee reiterates the provision of the conference report on the 1962 bill relating to the acquisition of these lands.)	900,000

In addition, the committee recommendation includes the following:

Stabilizing the banks of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal. (This work is to be accomplished outside the area of possible inundation by the proposed Corps of Engineers water resources project.)	$150,000
Construction in Civil War areas (including visitor centers at Fredericksburg, Vicksburg, and Petersburg National Military Parks, Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park, and Appomattox Court House National Historical Park)	1,000,000
Purchase of lands across the Potomac from Mount Vernon	937,000
Construction of a visitor center at Natural Bridges National Monument, Utah	150,000

No provision is made for funds for the Southwest Urban Renewal Area. This is an open-space project which should be accomplished under provisions of the Housing Act of 1961.

It is the desire of the committee that within available funds, $65,000 be used to acquire, subject to a life interest, all of the fixed

assets of Emery C. Kolb used in connection with a studio concession operation at Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.

CONSTRUCTION

(Liquidation of contract authorization)

Appropriation, 1962	$30,000,000
Budget estimate, 1963	30,000,000
House allowance	29,000,000
Committee recommendation	29,000,000

The committee recommends $29 million for road construction, the same amount as allowed by the House of Representatives. However, the committee believes that the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Monument towpath should be resurfaced so long as none of the resurfacing is within the 9 miles which are threatened by the proposed water resources project of the Corps of Engineers.

The recommendation of the committee includes $2,793,800 requested for initiation of construction of a Zoo bypass road in Rock Creek Park; and concurs with the House recommendations that $75,000 be used for roads and trails in the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial, Ind., that no buildings and utilities projects be constructed at Great Falls, Va., and that no roads, trails, and parking areas be constructed in the Virgin Islands National Park.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$1,581,000
Budget estimate, 1963	2,100,000
House allowance	1,900,000
Committee recommendation	1,964,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $1,964,000, $64,000 more than allowed by the House and $136,000 less than the budget estimate. The committee has restored $64,000 to provide funds for all 40 of the existing positions which are to be transferred from the construction appropriation.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The committee has allowed 27 of the 34 additional vehicles requested, including all of the police-type vehicles. These are needed for new parks and for additional facilities in existing parks.

Office of Territories

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $10,334,000
Budget estimate, 1963	[2] 15,478,000
House allowance	13,768,000
Committee recommendation	13,768,000

[1] Includes $4,500,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[2] Includes $2,579,000 in H. Doc. 334, 87th Congress.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $13,768,000, the same as the House allowance, and a decrease of $1,710,000 in the budget estimate, for "Administration of Territories." This includes $1,869,000 for a three-channel educational television system to further the educational program in American Samoa, a reduction of $710,000 in the amount requested for this purpose.

TRUST TERRITORIES OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $6,304,000
Budget estimate, 1963	10,000,000
House allowance	6,600,000
Committee recommendation	6,600,000

[1] Includes $200,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

The committee recommends $6,600,000 for the Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands. This is $3,400,000 less than the budget estimate, and the same amount as allowed by the House of Representatives. The act of June 30, 1954, places a limitation of $7,500,000 annually on appropriations for the trust territories, and while legislation is now pending in the Congress to increase this limitation to $15 million, it has not yet become law. The Department of the Navy will transfer to the trust territories $900,000 to finance a portion of the administrative costs when the headquarters of the Trust Territories of the Pacific is moved from Guam to Saipan.

The committee approves a departmental request to reprogram $200,000 included in the fiscal year 1963 budget estimate for Cliffline housing on Guam which is no longer needed. This sum is to be used in administration of the Saipan district. It is understood that none of these funds will be used for employing additional personnel.

ALASKA RAILROAD

The committee approves the use of $1,869,000, to be derived from operations of the Alaska Railroad, for additions and betterments, and replacements to the system.

Geological Survey

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS AND RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $49,820,000
Budget estimate, 1963	59,900,000
House allowance	56,100,000
Committee recommendation	56,900,000

[1] Includes $100,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

The committee recommends $56,900,000 for the U.S. Geological Survey. The committee approves the full amount requested for "Marine geology and hydrology" and has restored $300,000 of the $400,000 reduction made by the House of Representatives in funds for travel, supplies and materials, and equipment.

The committee has not approved the establishment of an Institute for Water Research. This new activity would require 163 additional permanent positions, which are included in the committee's nonallowance of this item.

Bureau of Mines

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1962	$24,800,000
Budget estimate, 1963	27,000,000
House allowance	26,550,000
Committee recommendation	26,887,000

The committee recommendation of $26,887,000 includes $187,000 to expand oil shale research, $100,000 for basic research on petroleum asphalt at the Laramie Petroleum Research Center, and $50,000 for development of methods of mining thick beds of coal with a high percentage recovery, development of supplies of coking coal, and a survey of coking coal resources. This is $337,000 more than the House allowance and $113,000 less than the budget estimate.

The committee believes that the Bureau of Mines should not be required to reprogram its funds in order to undertake research projects listed by the Office of Coal Research. Especially is this true in view of the Booz, Allen, and Hamilton report which recommends 7 technical projects for accomplishment, 4 of which are already included in the Bureau's program. The committee expects that the Bureau of Mines, together with the Office of Coal Research, will develop a program to assure that a project undertaken by one is not a duplication of a project to be undertaken by the other agency.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

Appropriation, 1962	$7, 200, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	8, 158, 000
House allowance	8, 158, 000
Committee recommendation	8, 158, 000

The committee recommends $8,158,000 for this activity, the same amount as the budget estimate and the allowance of the House of Representatives. The amount includes the $200,000 requested to initiate a new program appraising health and safety conditions in noncoal mines, as required by Public Law 87–300.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1962	$835, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	1, 000, 000
House allowance	425, 000
Committee recommendation	425, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $425,000, the same as the House allowance and $575,000 less than the budget estimate for 1963. This amount will permit initiation of planning in connection with relocation of the fuels and health and safety research functions of the Bureau of Mines from Pittsburgh to Bruceton, Pa,. and the proposed construction of a materials research center at Frederick, Md.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$1, 290, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	1, 333, 000
House allowance	1, 333, 000
Committee recommendation	1, 333, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of $1,333,000 for "General administrative expenses, Bureau of Mines." The committee agrees to the $15,000 increase in use of program funds for administrative expenses which was requested.

DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HELIUM PROPERTIES

(Borrowing authorization)

Appropriation, 1962	$10, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	20, 000, 000
House allowance	6, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	20, 000, 000

The committee recommends the budget estimate of $20 million in additional borrowing authority for the helium program of the Bureau of Mines. It is the feeling of the committee that availability of the entire amount of the borrowing authority requested will provide assurance that all available helium can be purchased and that helium which otherwise could be saved will not have to be wasted.

The committee does not approve the Bureau's request for authority to construct a new administration building at Amarillo, Tex., to provide consolidated office space for the operational headquarters now housed in various locations. The committee believes that an effort should be made to interest a lessor in constructing a satisfactory building at a suitable location.

Departmental Offices

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$1, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	2, 000, 000
House allowance	2, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	3, 450, 000

The committee recommends $3,450,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Coal Research." The increase over the budget estimate and the House allowance, $1,450,000, is for additional contract research on Project Bootstrap and Project Gasoline. The committee concurs with the House in limiting to $300,000 the funds available for administration and supervision.

The committee expects that the Office of Coal Research together with the Bureau of Mines will develop a program to assure that a project undertaken by one is not a duplication of a project to be undertaken by the other agency.

OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$750, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	1, 000, 000
House allowance	750, 000
Committee recommendation	875, 000

The committee recommends $875,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Minerals Exploration," $125,000 more than the House allowance. The committee concurs with the House in the limitation of $213,600 on use of these funds for administrative and technical services.

The committee believes that the funds provided should be available for exploration assistance with regard to all minerals now eligible for this assistance, except copper. Although not currently classified as critical and strategic, lead and nickel are in comparatively short supply in the United States. The known supply of lead ore reserves is sufficient for only 6 years' consumption in the United States at the average rate of use for the past 5 years. There is a 4-year supply of nickel available. Greater supplies of zinc and copper exist—13 and 27 years, respectively. This particular program is aimed at locating ore reserves for a long-term need, which should be interpreted as meaning a period of 25 to 50 years, or longer.

LEAD AND ZINC STABILIZATION

Appropriation, 1962	None
Budget estimate, 1963	$4,900,000
House allowance	2,450,000
Committee recommendation	2,450,000

The committee concurs with the allowance of the House of Representatives, $2,450,000, for the lead and zinc stabilization program of the Office of Minerals Exploration. This will provide funds for the last half of fiscal year 1963. Funds for the first half are contained in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1962.

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$531,000
Budget estimate, 1963	731,000
House allowance	531,000
Committee recommendation	531,000

The committee concurs with the House in recommending $531,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Office of Oil and Gas." The decrease of $200,000 represents the amount asked for defense functions, which are to be considered in another bill. The decrease will provide for 18 less permanent positions, all of which were for the emergency planning activities of the Office of Oil and Gas.

Fish and Wildlife Service

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$364,000
Budget estimate, 1963	364,000
House allowance	364,000
Committee recommendation	364,000

The committee recommends $364,000, the amount of the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House, for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife."

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $12,550,000
Budget estimate, 1963	15,213,000
House allowance	14,600,000
Committee recommendation	15,981,500

[1] Includes $400,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

The committee recommends an appropriation of $15,981,500, which is $1,381,500 more than the House allowance and $768,500 more than the budget estimate. Included in this recommendation is the full amount of the budget estimate for research of fish migration over dams and $56,500 of the $113,000 reduction imposed by the House of Representatives on funds for travel, supplies and materials, and equipment.

In addition, there is included $350,000 for increased biological research on shrimp in the Gulf of Mexico (in the cost of which the

industry should be encouraged to share), $125,000 for an accelerated program on research and development of shrimp gear, and $350,000 for a program of Atlantic herring research.

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

(Special foreign currency program)

Appropriation, 1962	$300,000
Budget estimate, 1963	300,000
House allowance	300,000
Committee recommendation	300,000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of $300,000 for purchase of foreign currencies to be used for research contracts in foreign countries.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1962	$7,561,000
Budget estimate, 1963	8,414,000
House allowance	7,900,000
Committee recommendation	8,473,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $8,473,000 for construction activities of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. This includes $413,000 of the $514,000 disallowed by the House. The $413,000 is approved in order that fixed equipment may be built into the laboratories to be constructed at Seattle, Wash., and Ann Arbor, Mich.

The amount recommended includes the following budgeted items:

Research laboratory at Seattle, Wash	$2,257,000
Biological laboratory, Ann Arbor, Mich	1,356,000
Radiobiological laboratory at Beaufort, N.C	394,000
Fishery research vessel as a replacement for *Black Douglas*	2,500,000
Design of a fishery research vessel for use in North Pacific and Bering Sea	150,000
Rehabilitation of warehouse and dock facilities at St. Simons Island Lighthouse Station, Ga	30,000
Columbia river fishery facilities	1,626,000

The amount also includes $160,000 to purchase land and accomplish land filling necessary in connection with construction of the Shellfish Research Center at Milford, Conn., authorized by Public Law 87–173.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

Appropriation, 1962	$750,000
Budget estimate, 1963	750,000
House allowance	750,000
Committee recommendation	750,000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of $750,000 for construction of fishing vessels. This is the full amount of the budget estimate, which is the same as the 1962 appropriation, and provides subsidy payments for fishing vessels constructed in U.S. shipyards.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$482,000
Budget estimate, 1963	616,000
House allowance	600,000
Committee recommendation	600,000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of funds for "General administrative expenses."

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

(Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1962	$1,981,000
Budget estimate, 1963	1,998,000
House allowance	1,998,000
Committee recommendation	1,998,000

The committee recommends $1,998,000 for "Administration of the Pribilof Islands." This is an increase of $17,000 over the amount available in fiscal year 1962. The funds are proceeds from sales of fur seal skins and other wildlife products of the Pribilof Islands; and will be used for managing the Alaska fur seal herd; schooling, medical attention, and other community services to natives of the Islands; and operation and maintenance of plants, roads, and other facilities.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FISHERIES LOAN FUND

Appropriation, 1962	$250,000
Budget estimate, 1963	250,000
House allowance	250,000
Committee recommendation	250,000

The committee recommends a limitation of $250,000 on administrative expenses for the fisheries loan fund. This is the limitation requested by the Department.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1962	$23,315,650
Budget estimate, 1963	26,572,000
House allowance	26,500,000
Committee recommendation	27,436,000

The committee recommends $27,436,000 for "Management and investigations of resources." In addition to the cooperative fishery unit at the University of Maine for which the House provided $30,000, the committee recommends the following additions to the appropriations requested for this activity:

Increased technical assistance in sport fishing management through cooperative programs with Indian tribes	$200,000
Cooperative fishery unit at the University of Georgia	30,000
Cooperative fishery unit at Louisiana State University	30,000
Cooperative fishery unit at Colorado State University	30,000
Cooperative fishery unit at North Carolina State College	30,000
Cooperative fishery unit at University of Missouri	30,000
Cooperative fishery unit at University of Hawaii	40,000
Cooperative wildlife research unit at South Dakota State College	17,000
Increased fish control research in waters of the Southeastern United States	105,000
Increased reservoir research in the White River interstate reservoir complex in northern Arkansas and southern Missouri	85,000
Fishery management team in eastern Tennessee	49,000
Fishery management project in Mississippi	15,000
Continuation of a fishery management project at Springville, Utah	25,000
Research on control and eradication of nutria	100,000
Expansion of research work and control of starlings and blackbirds. (This amount is in addition to the $200,000 increase over the budget estimate for this purpose approved by the House of Representatives.)	100,000
Expansion of predator control work in Arkansas	50,000

The committee concurs in the denial by the House of Representatives of $190,000 requested for continuation of studies of bird hazards to aircraft, which the Fish and Wildlife Service conducts for the Federal Aviation Agency. It is the opinion of the committee that provision for this item should be made in the bill providing appropriations for the Federal Aviation Agency.

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1962	$5, 257, 500
Budget estimate, 1963	4, 086, 000
House allowance	4, 900, 000
Committee recommendation	8, 033, 800

The committee recommends an appropriation of $8,033,800 for construction of fish hatcheries, wildlife refuges, and fish and wildlife research facilities.

In addition to the matter proposed in the budget estimate, this amount will provide for the following additional hatchery construction proposed by the House:

Dale Hollow Dam, Tenn	$195, 000
Orangeburg, S. C	141, 000
Norfolk, Ark	185, 000
Chattahooche Forest, Ga	134, 000
Wytheville, Va	175, 000

The committee has added $3,133,800 to provide for the following which are not included in the budget estimate:

Needed facilities to expand the program at the Atlantic Game Fish Research Center, Sandy Hook, N.J	$150, 000
Completion of Alchesay National Fish Hatchery, Arizona	93, 000
Additional rearing ponds at Gavins Point National Fish Hatchery, South Dakota	60, 000
Additional facilities at Cohutta National Fish Hatchery, Georgia	164, 300
Completion of Garrison Dam National Fish Hatchery, North Dakota	90, 000
Completion of Bowden National Fish Hatchery, West Virginia	62, 000
Additional facilities at Hagerman National Fish Hatchery, Idaho	100, 000
Completion of Leadville National Fish Hatchery, Colorado	65, 000
Modernization work at Marion National Fish Hatchery, Alabama	280, 000
Completion of Lyman National Fish Hatchery, Mississippi	192, 500
Modernization work at the Quilcene National Fish Hatchery, Washington	132, 000
Additional improvement of Greers Ferry National Fish Hatchery, Arkansas	170, 000
Improvements at the Federal Fish Farm Experiment Station, Kelso, Arkansas	225, 000
Additional facilities at Ennis National Fish Hatchery, Montana	89, 000
Completion of Jordan River National Fish Hatchery, Michigan	366, 000
Initiation of construction of Northern Great Plains Wildlife Research Station, North Dakota	330, 000
Establishment of a fish genetics facility in Wyoming	460, 000
Improvement of the road from Brigham City, Utah, to the headquarters of the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge	105, 000

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1962	None
Budget estimate, 1963	$7, 000, 000
House allowance	7, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	7, 000, 000

The Senate concurs with the House allowance of $7 million for the migratory bird conservation account. The purpose of this appropriation is acceleration of acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat as authorized by the act of October 4, 1961.

The committee directs that no staff be formed to carry out the program until such time as the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota have assented to purchase of lands in those States as required by law.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$1, 071, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	1, 331, 000
House allowance	1, 250, 000
Committee recommendation	1, 331, 000

The committee recommends $1,331,000, the full amount of the budget estimate, and $81,000 more than the House allowance. It is the committee's view that the management program of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife is expanded sufficiently to require all of the funds requested.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The committee approves the request of the Fish and Wildlife Service to purchase not to exceed 124 passenger motor vehicles, 92 of which would be for replacement only.

Office of Saline Water

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $5, 255, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	7, 700, 000
House allowance	7, 600, 000
Committee recommendation	7, 700, 000

[1] Includes $3,500,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

The committee recommends the full amount of the budget estimate, $7,700,000, for "Salaries and expenses," which provides $3,275,000 for basic research and $3,800,000 for applied research. The committee also approves the agency's request of $625,000 for administration and coordination of proposals for original research and for process development.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1962	None
Budget estimate, 1963	[1] $2, 085, 000
House allowance	2, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	2, 085, 000

[1] For activities previously carried under "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Office of Saline Water."

The committee recommends an appropriation of $2,085,000, the budget estimate and $85,000 more than the House allowance, for "Operation and maintenance, Office of Saline Water." The committee believes that the limitation on administrative expenses should be increased from $175,000 to $225,000, and so recommends.

Office of the Solicitor

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$3,492,000
Budget estimate, 1963	3,747,000
House allowance	3,600,000
Committee recommendation	3,747,000

The committee recommends $3,747,000, the amount of the budget estimate, and $147,000 more than the House allowance, for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor." Today, with a greatly increased workload, the Department of the Interior has some 35 less attorneys than it had in January 1952; but since that time salaries have increased 25 percent; retirement deposits at the rate of 6.5 percent have to be made; and per diem allowances have increased 70 percent.

Office of the Secretary

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $3,385,000
Budget estimate, 1963	3,568,000
House allowance	3,350,000
Committee recommendation	3,340,000

[1] Includes $200,000 in Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1962.

The committee recommends $3,340,000 for the Office of the Secretary, $10,000 less than the House allowance, and $228,000 less than the budget estimate. In addition to denying the request for $106,500 for defense activities formerly provided by the Office of Emergency Planning, the committee has denied the proposed increase of $121,500 for the Division of Information, disallowing the 13 additional positions requested. The committee has allowed the proposed increase of $93,100 for administrative management services, including the increase of nine positions requested.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

FOREST LAND MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1962	$128,000,000
Budget estimate, 1963	140,740,000
House allowance	138,400,000
Committee recommendation	141,045,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $141,045,000 for "Forest land management," which includes the full budget estimate for timber sales administration and management ($23,180,000); acquisition of land ($500,000); and the sum needed for travel, supplies and materials, and equipment. In addition the committee has approved $125,000 to initiate acquisition of lands to be added to the Monongahela National Forest, $180,000 to purchase Manistee National Forest lands on the Lake Michigan shore, and $300,000 for forest fire presuppression and prevention in southern California. The

recommended amount is $305,000 greater than the budget estimate and $2,645,000 more than the House allowance.

The committee believes that in expenditure of the $800,000 restored for timber sales administration and management full attention should be given to the problems faced by small operators whose operations are confined mainly to Ponderosa pine.

The House committee directed that the Forest Service provide the $30,000 requested by the Virgin Islands Corporation for continuing forestry work in the Virgin Islands. However, the Forest Service is not authorized to carry on this work under "Forest land management" because work under that activity is limited to national forests and lands immediately adjacent thereto. The committee concurs with the House indication that the Forest Service should care for this work in the Virgin Islands and therefore has added $30,000 to the appropriation for "State and private forestry cooperation."

FOREST RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1962	$26,368,000
Budget estimate, 1963	23,150,000
House allowance	22,975,000
Committee recommendation	25,865,000

The committee recommends $25,865,000, which is $2,715,000 more than the budget estimate of $23,150,000, for "Forest research."

The committee proposes an increase of $2,890,000 over the House allowance for the following:

Raising the level of the research program at the Hardwood Research Center, Stoneville, Miss	$50,000
Expanded research program on restoration of strip-mined land in the Appalachian region	200,000
Expansion of study of timber processing and marketing problems in Kentucky	60,000
Initiation of construction of a Watershed Management Laboratory, Tempe, Ariz	450,000
Construction of a Watershed Management Laboratory at Parsons, W. Va	150,000
Initiation of construction of a Forest Research Laboratory, Alexandria, La	450,000
Initiation of construction of Forest Recreation and Wildlife Habitat Laboratory, Warren, Pa	250,000
Construction of a Silviculture Laboratory, Sewanee, Tenn	200,000
Preliminary planning and engineering for expansion of Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis	380,000
Initiation of construction of a Watershed and Hydraulics Laboratory, Logan, Utah	450,000
Establishment of a Pine Management and Insect Control Laboratory, Redding, Calif	250,000

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

Appropriation, 1962	$15,800,000
Budget estimate, 1963	15,800,000
House allowance	15,800,000
Committee recommendation	16,405,000

The committee recommends $16,405,000 for "State and private forestry cooperation." This is $605,000 more than the budget estimate and the House allowance. The committee has added the following amounts to the budget estimate of $15,800,000:

For forestry work in the Virgin Islands	$30,000
For forest fire control	500,000
For nursery production and distribution	75,000

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

(Liquidation of contract authorization)

Appropriation, 1962	$35, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	37, 500, 000
House allowance	37, 500, 000
Committee recommendation	37, 500, 000

The committee concurs with the House of Representatives in the budget estimate of $37,500,000 for "Forest roads and trails."

A strong and convincing presentation was made to the committee for funds to construct a road linking the Cherokee National Forest in Tennessee with the Nantahala National Forest in North Carolina. Lack of authorization prevented committee consideration of the proposal. It is the committee's hope that a request for authorization will be placed before appropriate legislative committees for attention.

ACCESS ROADS

Appropriation, 1962	$2, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	2, 000, 000
House allowance	None
Committee recommendation	2, 000, 000

The committee recommends $2 million for purchase or condemnation of existing roads or rights-of-way needed to provide access to national forest areas. Even though the Comptroller General has held that the Forest Service may recover from benefiting landowners their proportionate share of the construction cost of roads built under the Federal-Aid Highway Act, the ruling came too late to permit the Forest Service to adjust its proposed road program to eliminate this particular budget request. Furthermore, the amount of Federal-Aid Highway Act funds authorized for forest roads and trails is insufficient for construction required to manage and market the timber resources.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

Appropriation, 1962	$250, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	2, 000, 000
House allowance	2, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	2, 000, 000

The committee recommends $2 million for acquisition of lands for the Superior National Forest. This amount will complete the wilderness canoe area purchases and is the remainder of the amount for which there is legislative authorization.

SPECIAL ACTS, CACHE NATIONAL FOREST

(Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1962	$10, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	10, 000
House allowance	10, 000
Committee recommendation	10, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of $10,000 of national forest receipts for acquisition of lands in the Cache National Forest, which are critical from a watershed and erosion control standpoint to enable control and minimization of soil erosion and flood damage.

SPECIAL ACTS, UINTA AND WASATCH NATIONAL FORESTS

(Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1962	None
Budget estimate, 1963	None
House allowance	None
Committee recomendation	$20,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $20,000 from receipts of the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests to minimize soil erosion and flood damage. It is estimated that the lands needed to protect this particular area fully can be acquired in a period of 4 or 5 years.

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

(Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1962	$700,000
Budget estimate, 1963	700,000
House allowance	700,000
Committee recommendation	700,000

The committee recommends $700,000, the amount of the budget estimate and the House allowance, for "Cooperative range improvements." This money is to be derived from grazing fees received by the Treasury from each national forest under the provisions of the Granger-Thye Act.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

Appropriation, 1962	$1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1963	1,000,000
House allowance	1,000,000
Committee recommendation	1,500,000

The committee recommends $1,500,000 for "Assistance to States for tree planting" under authorization of title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1956. This is $500,000 greater than the amount of the budget estimate and of the House allowance. This fund will permit implementation of a cooperative plan, to which each participating State contributes, of forestation through planting, seeding, or site preparation and natural seeding.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The committee recommends that the Forest Service have authority to purchase a total of 179 motor vehicles. The 27 vehicles included in this action but denied by the House are for use in those areas where General Services Administration equipment is inadequate and where common carrier facilities are not sufficient to meet the Forest Service program needs.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$70,000
Budget estimate, 1963	70,000
House allowance	70,000
Committee recommendation	70,000

The committee recommends $70,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review." This is the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance.

Commission of Fine Arts

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$70,000
Budget estimate, 1963	80,000
House allowance	70,000
Committee recommendation	80,000

The committee recommends $80,000, an increase of $10,000 over the House allowance, and the same amount as the budget estimate. The committee is convinced that the Fine Arts Commission does require an employee who can devote his time to compiling annual reports and special reports, and performing other editorial work required of the Commission.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1962	$53,010,000
Budget estimate, 1963	55,834,000
House allowance	55,284,000
Committee recommendation	57,000,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $57 million, $1,166,000 more than the budget estimate, for "Indian health activities." This is $1,716,000 more than the House allowance and does provide $550,000 requested to replace the present practice of utilizing contractual authority for making advance purchases for Alaska activities. The restoration of this amount does not increase the program of the Public Health Service, but eliminates the necessity for making advance obligations against funds not appropriated, even though that action is authorized by law. The committee understands that advance purchases for Alaska activities chargeable to future appropriations will not again be made, even though legislative authority remains available.

The committee recommendation will provide $34,281,000 for hospital health services; $10,933,000 for contract patient care; $10,284,000 for field health services; and $1,502,000 for administration, which are increases over the 1962 appropriation of $1,518,000, $1,165,000, $1,062,427 and $5,000, respectively.

CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1962	$8, 285, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	9, 220, 000
House allowance	8, 320, 000
Committee recommendation	9, 335, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $9,335,000 for "Construction of Indian health facilities," $1,015,000 more than allowed by the House, and $115,000 over the budget estimate. The Department advises that as of March 15, 1962, only $700,000 of the $3 million appropriated for sanitation facilities in fiscal year 1962 remained uncommitted, and that the remainder of the last year's appropriation would be committed to projects by the close of this fiscal year.

The amount recommended will provide $3,508,000 for construction of a hospital at Fort Yates, N. Dak., one at Barrow, Alaska, and health centers at Mescalero, N. Mex.; Fort Hall, Idaho, and Peach Springs, Ariz.; as well as health stations at Arapahoe, Wyo.; Rocky Boy, Mont.; and Gambell, Alaska; $535,000 for personnel quarters; $1,377,000 for alterations at various health facilities; $100,000 for participation in construction of a community hospital at Chamberlain S. Dak.; $4,000,000 for construction of Indian sanitation facilities; and $115,000 for planning of a general medical and surgical hospital at Lawton, Okla.

Indian Claims Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$280, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	295, 000
House allowance	290, 000
Committee recommendation	290, 000

The committee recommends $290,000 for the Indian Claims Commission. This is $5,000 less than the budget estimate and the same amount as the House allowance.

National Capital Planning Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$525, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	625, 000
House allowance	625, 000
Committee recommendation	625, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of $625,000 for salaries and expenses of the National Capital Planning Commission.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OPEN SPACE STUDY, NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Appropriation, 1962	None
Budget estimate, 1963	$65, 000
House allowance	None
Committee recommendation	None

The committee concurs with the action of the House of Representatives in disallowing the $65,000 requested for consulting services in connection with an open space study for the National Capital region. The committee has approved a requested increase of $100,000 over the 1962 appropriation for "Salaries and expenses," which is the proper place for this activity.

LAND ACQUISITION, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK, PARKWAY, AND PLAYGROUND SYSTEM

Appropriation, 1962	$500,000
Budget estimate, 1963	1,300,000
House allowance	100,000
Committee recommendation	100,000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of $100,000 to complete acquisition of lands for the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Montgomery County, Md., and to connect that parkway with the Little Falls Parkway.

National Capital Transportation Agency

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $960,000
Budget estimate, 1963	4,450,000
House allowance	3,350,000
Committee recommendation	2,825,000

[1] Includes $85,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

The committee recommends $2,825,000 for "Salaries and expenses, National Capital Transportation Agency." This is a decrease of $1,625,000 in the budget estimate and a decrease of $525,000 in the House allowance. The committee recommendation will provide $175,000 for engineering plans, $1,150,000 for engineering feasibility analyses, $250,000 for planning and economic studies, and $1,250,000 for personnel compensation and other expenses. A reduction in the amounts requested for engineering plans and engineering feasibility analyses is recommended, since it appears from the information furnished by the Agency that the amounts proposed are all that will be expended prior to the time next year when the National Capital Transportation Agency expects to come before Congress for authorization required to construct a transit system.

LAND ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1962	[1] $1,000,000
Budget estimate, 1963	2,000,000
House allowance	400,000
Committee recommendation	400,000

[1] In Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.

The committee concurs with the House allowance of $400,000 for acquisition of median strips in Interstate Route 66, Virginia, and Interstate Route 95, Maryland, and for incidental construction on the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

Smithsonian Institution

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$9, 125, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	11, 354, 000
House allowance	10, 900, 000
Committee recommendation	10, 900, 000

The committee recommends $10,900,000 for "Salaries and expenses of the Smithsonian Institution," which is $454,000 less than the budget estimate, and the same as the House allowance. The reduction below the estimate is made because of a delay in completion of the Museum of History and Technology now under construction, making unnecessary the funds requested for operation and maintenance of that building. The remaining items of the budget estimate are approved.

Remodeling of Civil Service Commission Building

Appropriation, 1962	$400, 000
Budget estimate, 1963	5,400, 000
House allowance	None
Committee recommendation	None

The committee recommends that no funds be provided to the Smithsonian Institution for remodeling of the Civil Service Commission Building. Since preparation of the budget estimate, it has become evident that the new Civil Service Commission Building will not be available as planned. Therefore, the Smithsonian Institution will be unable to ready the old building as an art gallery for the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery. It is expected that funds necessary to accomplish this remodeling will be requested again in fiscal year 1964.

Construction and Improvements, National Zoological Park

Appropriation, 1962	None
Budget estimate, 1963	$950, 000
House allowance	1, 275, 000
Committee recommendation	1, 275, 000

The committee concurs in the House allowance of $1,275,000 for construction and improvements at the National Zoological Park. This recommendation approves the House increase of $325,000 in the budget estimate, which will permit completion of construction to relocate entirely the road from Connecticut Avenue to Harvard Street.

National Gallery of Art

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$1,932,000
Budget estimate, 1963	2,054,000
House allowance	2,054,000
Committee recommendation	2,054,000

The committee recommends $2,054,000 for "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art." This is the same amount as the budget estimate and the House allowance.

Transitional Grants to Alaska

Appropriation, 1962	$6,000,000
Budget estimate, 1963	3,000,000
House allowance	3,000,000
Committee recommendation	3,000,000

The committee recommends $3 million, the amount of the budget estimate, which is provided by the Alaska omnibus act. This sum will cover in part the cost which would have been borne by the Federal Government had Alaska remained a Territory, as well as certain additional funds to cover the cost of improving airports and other facilities taken over by the State of Alaska.

Civil War Centennial Commission

EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$100,000
Budget estimate, 1963	100,000
House allowance	100,000
Committee recommendation	100,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $100,000 for expenses of the Civil War Centennial Commission. This is the same amount as the budget estimate and the House allowance.

TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

CONTRIBUTIONS

Appropriation, 1962	[1]
Budget estimate, 1963	$185,000
House allowance	None
Committee recommendation	None

[1] Appropriation act language provides $669,000 by transfer from internal revenue collections appropriated for the Virgin Islands.

The committee concurs with the action of the House in deleting the budget request of $185,000 as a contribution to the Virgin Islands Corporation. However, elsewhere in this bill the committee has provided $30,000 to enable the Forest Service to carry on the forestry activities which were covered by this budget estimate.

REVOLVING FUND

Appropriation, 1962	$881,000
Budget estimate, 1963	3,300,000
House allowance	200,000
Committee recommendation	200,000

The committee concurs with the House allowanee of $200,000 for the revolving fund. This amount will provide for housing a generator for which reprograming of $400,000 of fiseal year 1962 funds was made available. The recommendation is $3,100,000 less than the amount of the budget estimate.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1962	$180,000
Budget estimate, 1963	200,000
House allowance	180,000
Committee reeommendation	180,000

The committee eoneurs with the allowanee of the House of Representatives of $180,000 as a limitation on administrative expenses of the Virgin Islands Corporation. This is a decrease of $20,000 in the budget estimate but in view of the recommendation of the committee that the proposed power program be reduced by over $3 million, this amount would appear to be sufficient.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1962 AND THE ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

	Appropriation estimate, 1962	Appropriation estimate, 1963	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Department of the Interior: [1]			
Payments to States (proceeds of sales)	$260,000	$269,000	+$9,000
Payments of royalties to Oklahoma	7,000	10,000	+3,000
Leasing of grazing lands	1,000	1,000	----------
Payments to States (grazing fees)	1,000	1,000	----------
Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, payment to Coos Bay and Douglas Counties, Oreg., in lieu of taxes	100,000	100,000	----------
Oregon and California grant lands, payment to counties	14,455,000	15,500,000	+1,045,000
Payments to States from grazing receipts, public lands	583,000	875,000	+292,000
Mineral Leasing Act, payment to States	38,297,000	42,000,000	+3,703,000
Expenses, sale of timber, etc., on reclamation land	2,000	2,000	----------
Payments due counties, national grasslands, Bureau of Land Management	215,000	215,000	----------
Expenses, Public Land Administration Act	500,000	500,000	----------
Claim and treaty obligations, Indian Affairs	140,000	161,000	+21,000
Operation and maintenance, revenue, Indian irrigation systems	2,679,300	3,000,000	+320,700
Power revenues, Indian irrigation projects	1,600,000	1,700,000	+100,000
Acquisition of lands and loans to Indians in Oklahoma, act of June 26, 1936	10,000	10,000	----------
Indian arts and crafts fund	200	200	----------
Colorado River Indian Reservation benefits, southern and northern reserves	180,000	180,000	----------
Education expenses, children of employees, Yellowstone National Park	139,100	238,000	+98,900
Operation, management, and maintenance and demolition of federally acquired properties, Independence National Historical Park, National Park Service	21,650	6,000	−15,650

Payment to State of Wyoming, in lieu of taxes on lands in Grand Teton National Park, National Park Service	28,259	28,000	−259
Payments from proceeds of sale of water, Geological Survey	1,000	1,000	
Payment to Alaska from Pribilof Islands receipts	536,809	621,600	+84,791
Migratory bird conservation fund	5,000,000	5,000,000	
Federal aid in wildlife restoration	14,985,093	15,300,000	+314,907
Federal aid in fish restoration and management	6,253,432	5,800,000	−453,432
Management of national wildlife refuges	1,490,519	1,500,000	+9,481
Expenses incident to sale of refuge products	95,000	108,377	+13,377
Payment to counties under Migratory Bird Conservation Act	496,840	500,000	+3,160
Payment to Alaska, Alaska game law	1,000	1,000	
Payments due counties, national grasslands, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	4,000	4,000	
Internal Revenue collections for Virgin Islands, Office of Territories	6,842,000	7,000,000	+$158,000
Total, Department of the Interior	94,925,202	100,632,177	+5,706,975
Department of Agriculture—Forest Service:			
Expenses, brush disposal	9,000,000	9,000,000	
Roads and trails for States (10 percent fund)	10,020,000	11,600,000	+1,580,000
Forest fire prevention (Smokey Bear)	20,000	20,000	
Restoration of forest lands and improvements	196,000	196,000	
Payment to Minnesota (Cook, Lake, and St. Louis Counties)	123,300	123,300	
Payments due counties, submarginal land program	425,000	425,000	
Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico	99,200	115,000	+15,800
Payments to States, National Forests Fund (25-percent fund)	25,045,000	29,000,000	+3,955,000
Total, Department of Agriculture—Forest Service	44,928,500	50,479,300	+5,550,800
Total, permanent appropriations	139,853,702	151,111,477	+11,257,775

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January, 1962, budget document for 1963. Subject to further revision.

[1] Exclusive of Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration.

TRUST FUNDS

(Not a charge against general budget revenues)

	Appropriation estimate, 1962	Appropriation estimate, 1963	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Department of the Interior: [1]			
Deposits by individuals for surveying public lands	$25,000	$25,000	
Administration and protection of grazing districts	400,000	400,000	
Trust funds, Alaska townsites, Bureau of Land Management	29,000	29,000	
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor	2,005,879	2,059,000	+$53,121
Miscellaneous trust funds of Indian tribes	79,340,327	54,183,000	−25,157,327
Donations, including land, National Parks	800,000	300,000	−500,000
Gifts or bequests of personal property, National Parks	5,000	5,000	
Birthplace of Abraham Lincoln, preservation of, National Parks	2,540	2,540	
Contributions, Jefferson National Expansion Memorial	2,832,517		−2,832,517
Advances, authorized services, Geological Survey	2,300,000	2,300,000	
Contributed funds, Bureau of Mines	1,120,000	1,020,000	−100,000
Contributed funds, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	747,000	747,000	
Inspection and grading of fishery products, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	394,000	394,000	
Contributed funds, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	58,000	54,000	−4,000
Total, Department of the Interior	90,059,263	61,518,540	−28,540,723
Department of Agriculture—Forest Service: Cooperative work	21,500,000	22,000,000	+500,000

Other agencies:			
National Capital Planning Commission: Contributed funds	577,000	100,000	−477,000
Smithsonian Institution: Canal Zone biological area fund	15,000	15,000	
Contributions, Indian health facilities	425,000	300,000	−125,000
Total, other agencies	1,017,000	415,000	−602,000
Grand total	112,576,263	83,933,540	−28,642,723

[1] Exclusive of Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration.

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January 1962 budget document for 1963. Subject to further revision.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1962, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	House bill
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT							
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT							
Management of lands and resources	[1] $33,750,000	[2] $43,252,000	$39,375,000	$41,022,200	+$7,272,200	−$2,229,800	+$1,647,200
Construction	850,000	[3] 1,300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+150,000	−300,000	
Oregon and California grant lands (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(7,750,000)	(7,750,000)	(7,750,000)	(7,750,000)			
Range improvements (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(740,000)	(1,045,000)	(1,045,000)	(1,045,000)	(+305,000)		
Total, Bureau of Land Management	34,600,000	[4] 44,552,000	40,375,000	42,022,200	+7,422,200	−2,529,800	+1,647,200
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS							
Education and welfare services	[5] 71,750,000	82,827,000	81,000,000	82,827,000	+11,077,000		+1,827,000
Resources management	29,075,000	34,417,000	34,300,000	34,677,000	+5,602,000	+260,000	+377,000
Revolving fund for loans	[6] 4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000			
Construction	39,561,000	54,765,000	52,000,000	55,550,000	+15,989,000	+785,000	+3,550,000
Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	16,000,000	17,000,000	16,000,000	17,000,000	+1,000,000		+1,000,000
General administrative expenses	3,967,000	4,372,000	4,000,000	4,350,000	+383,000	−22,000	+350,000
Liquidation of Klamath and Menominee Agencies	31,000				−31,000		
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	164,384,000	197,381,000	191,300,000	198,404,000	+34,020,000	+1,023,000	+7,104,000
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)			

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE							
Management and protection	[7] 21,811,500	27,240,000	25,425,000	26,034,320	+4,222,820	−1,205,680	+609,320
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	17,869,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	+2,131,000		
Construction	[8] 36,726,000	44,000,000	40,000,000	44,526,000	+7,800,000	+526,000	+4,526,000
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	30,000,000	30,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	−1,000,000	−1,000,000	
General administrative expenses	1,581,000	2,100,000	1,900,000	1,964,000	+383,000	−136,000	+64,000
Total, National Park Service	107,987,500	123,340,000	116,325,000	121,524,320	+13,536,820	−1,815,680	+5,199,320
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES							
Administration of territories	[9] 10,334,000	[10] 15,478,000	13,768,000	13,768,000	+3,434,000	−1,710,000	
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	[11] 6,304,000	10,000,000	6,600,000	6,600,000	+296,000	−3,400,000	
Alaska public works	([12])						
Total, Office of Territories	16,638,000	25,478,000	20,368,000	20,368,000	+3,730,000	−5,110,000	
Total, Public Land Management	323,609,500	390,751,000	368,368,000	382,318,520	+58,709,020	−8,432,480	+13,950,520
MINERAL RESOURCES							
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY							
Surveys, investigations, and research	[13] 49,820,000	59,900,000	56,100,000	56,900,000	+7,080,000	−3,000,000	+800,000
BUREAU OF MINES							
Conservation and development of mineral resources	24,800,000	[14] 27,000,000	26,550,000	26,887,000	+2,087,000	−113,000	+337,000
Health and safety	7,200,000	[14] 8,158,000	8,158,000	8,158,000	+958,000		
Construction	835,000	1,000,000	425,000	425,000	−410,000	−575,000	
General administrative expenses	1,290,000	1,333,000	1,333,000	1,333,000	+43,000		
Development and operation of helium properties (borrowing authorization)	(10,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(+10,000,000)		(+14,000,000)
Total, bureau of Mines	34,125,000	37,491,000	36,466,000	36,803,000	+2,678,000	−688,000	+337,000
OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH							
Salaries and expenses	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	3,450,000	+2,450,000	+1,450,000	+1,450,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 39.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for fiscal year 1962, and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1963—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	House bill
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued							
MINERAL RESOURCES—Continued							
OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION							
Salaries and expenses	$750,000	$1,000,000	$750,000	$875,000	+$125,000	−$125,000	+$125,000
Lead and zinc stabilization program		4,900,000	2,450,000	2,450,000	+2,450,000	−2,450,000	
Total, Office of Minerals Exploration	750,000	5,900,000	3,200,000	3,325,000	+2,575,000	−2,575,000	+125,000
OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS							
Salaries and expenses	531,000	[15] 731,000	531,000	531,000		−200,000	
OFFICE OF MINERALS MOBILIZATION							
Salaries and expenses		[16] 180,000				−180,000	
Total, Mineral Resources	86,226,000	106,202,000	98,297,000	101,009,000	+14,783,000	−5,193,000	+2,712,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE							
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE							
Salaries and expenses	364,000	364,000	364,000	364,000			
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES							
Management and investigations of resources	[17] 12,550,000	15,213,000	14,600,000	15,981,500	+3,431,500	+768,500	+1,381,500
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program)	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000			
Construction	7,561,000	8,414,000	7,900,000	8,473,000	+912,000	+59,000	+573,000
Construction of fishing vessels	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000			

General administrative expenses	482,000	616,000	600,000	600,000	+118,000	−16,000	
Administration of Pribilof Islands (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(1,981,000)	(1,998,000)	(1,998,000)	(1,998,000)	(+17,000)		
Limitation on administrative expenses, Fisheries loan fund	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)			
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	21,643,000	25,293,000	24,150,000	26,104,500	+4,461,500	+811,500	+1,954,500
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE							
Management and investigations of resources	23,315,650	[18] 26,572,000	26,500,000	27,436,000	+4,120,350	+864,000	+936,000
Construction	5,257,500	4,086,000	4,900,000	8,033,800	+2,776,300	+3,947,800	+3,133,800
Migratory bird conservation account		7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000		
General administrative expenses	1,071,000	1,331,000	1,250,000	1,331,000	+260,000		+81,000
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	29,644,150	38,989,000	39,650,000	43,800,800	+14,156,650	+4,811,800	+4,150,800
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	51,651,150	64,646,000	64,164,000	70,269,300	+18,618,150	+5,623,300	+6,105,300
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER							
Salaries and expenses	[19] 5,255,000	7,700,000	7,600,000	7,700,000	+2,445,000		+100,000
Operation and maintenance		[20] 2,085,000	2,000,000	2,085,000	+2,085,000		+85,000
Construction, operation, and maintenance	4,550,000				−4,550,000		
Total, Office of Saline Water	9,805,000	9,785,000	9,600,000	9,785,000	−20,000		+185,000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR							
Salaries and expenses	3,492,000	3,747,000	3,600,000	3,747,000	+255,000		+147,000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY							
Salaries and expenses	[21] 3,385,000	[22] 3,568,000	3,350,000	3,340,000	−45,000	−228,000	−10,000
Total, definite appropriations	478,168,650	578,699,000	547,379,000	570,468,820	+92,300,170	−8,230,180	+23,089,820
Total, indefinite appropriations of receipts	10,471,000	10,793,000	10,793,000	10,793,000	+322,000		
Total, borrowing authorizations	10,000,000	20,000,000	6,000,000	20,000,000	+10,000,000		+14,000,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior	498,639,650	609,492,000	564,172,000	601,261,820	+102,622,170	−8,230,180	+37,089,820

See footnotes at end of table, p. 39.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for fiscal year 1962, and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1963—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	House bill
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES							
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE							
FOREST SERVICE							
Forest protection and utilization:							
Forest land management	$128,000,000	$140,740,000	$138,400,000	$141,045,000	+$13,045,000	+$305,000	+$2,645,000
Forest research	26,368,000	23,150,000	22,975,000	25,865,000	−503,000	+2,715,000	+2,890,000
State and private forestry cooperation	15,800,000	15,800,000	15,800,000	16,405,000	+605,000	+605,000	+605,000
Total, Forest protection and utilization	170,168,000	179,690,000	177,175,000	183,315,000	+13,147,000	+3,625,000	+6,140,000
Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	35,000,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	+2,500,000	----------	----------
Access roads	2,000,000	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------	----------	+2,000,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:							
Superior National Forest	250,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	+1,750,000	----------	----------
Special acts (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(30,000)	(+20,000)	(+20,000)	(+20,000)
Cooperative range improvements (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	----------	----------	----------
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	+500,000	+500,000	+500,000
Total, definite appropriations	208,418,000	222,190,000	217,675,000	226,315,000	+17,897,000	+4,125,000	+8,640,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	710,000	710,000	710,000	730,000	+20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Total, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture	209,128,000	222,900,000	218,385,000	227,045,000	+17,917,000	+4,145,000	+8,660,000

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW							
Salaries and expenses	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000			
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS							
Salaries and expenses	70,000	80,000	70,000	80,000	+10,000		+10,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE							
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE							
Indian health activities	53,010,000	55,834,000	55,284,000	57,000,000	+3,990,000	+1,166,000	+1,716,000
Construction of Indian health activities	8,285,000	9,220,000	8,320,000	9,335,000	+1,050,000	+115,000	+1,015,000
Total, Public Health Service	61,295,000	65,054,000	63,604,000	66,335,000	+5,040,000	+1,281,000	+2,731,000
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	280,000	295,000	290,000	290,000	+10,000	−5,000	
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	525,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	+100,000		
Salaries and expenses, open space study, National Capital region		65,000				−65,000	
Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system	500,000	1,300,000	100,000	100,000	−400,000	−1,200,000	
Total, National Capital Planning Commission	1,025,000	1,990,000	725,000	725,000	−300,000	−1,265,000	
NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY							
Salaries and expenses	[23] 960,000	4,450,000	3,350,000	2,825,000	+1,865,000	−1,625,000	−525,000
Land acquisition and construction	[24] 1,000,000	2,000,000	400,000	400,000	−600,000	−1,600,000	
Total, National Capital Transportation Agency	1,960,000	6,450,000	3,750,000	3,225,000	+1,265,000	−3,225,000	−525,000
OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses	550,000				−550,000		

See footnotes at end of table, p. 39.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for fiscal year 1962, and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for fiscal year 1963—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	House allowance	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1962	Budget estimates, 1963	House bill
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued							
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION							
Salaries and expenses	$9,125,000	$11,354,000	$10,900,000	$10,900,000	+$1,775,000	−$454,000	
Additions to the Natural History Building	4,336,000				−4,336,000		
Remodeling of Civil Service Commission Building	400,000	5,400,000			−400,000	−5,400,000	
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park		950,000	1,275,000	1,275,000	+1,275,000	+325,000	
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	1,932,000	2,054,000	2,054,000	2,054,000	+122,000		
Total, Smithsonian Institution	15,793,000	19,758,000	14,229,000	14,229,000	−1,564,000	−5,529,000	
TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA							
Grants	6,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	−3,000,000		
CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION							
Expenses	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000			
Total, definite appropriations	295,561,000	318,987,000	303,513,000	314,369,000	+18,808,000	−4,618,000	+$10,856,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	710,000	710,000	710,000	730,000	+20,000	+20,000	+20,000
Total, title II, related agencies	296,271,000	319,697,000	304,223,000	315,099,000	+18,828,000	−4,598,000	+10,876,000
TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION							
Contributions	(23)	185,000				−185,000	
Revolving fund	881,000	3,300,000	200,000	200,000	−681,000	−3,100,000	
Limitation of administrative expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation	(180,000)	(200,000)	(180,000)	(180,000)		(−20,000)	
Total, title III, Virgin Islands Corporation	881,000	3,485,000	200,000	200,000	−681,000	−3,285,000	

Grand total:							
Definite appropriations	774, 610, 650	901, 171, 000	851, 092, 000	885, 037, 820	+110, 427, 170	−16, 133, 180	+33, 945, 820
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	11, 181, 000	11, 503, 000	11, 503, 000	11, 523, 000	+342, 000	+20, 000	+20, 000
Borrowing authorizations	10, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	20, 000, 000	+10, 000, 000	----------	+14, 000, 000
Total	795, 791, 650	932, 674, 000	868, 595, 000	916, 560, 820	+120, 769, 170	−16, 113, 180	+47, 965. 820

[1] Includes $1,250,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[2] Includes $1,700,000 in S. Doc. 88.
[3] Includes $300,000 in S. Doc. 88.
[4] Includes $2,000,000 in S. Doc. 88.
[5] Includes $750,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[6] Appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[7] Includes $25,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[8] Includes $2,250,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[9] Includes $4,500,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[10] Includes budget amendment of $2,579,000 for American Samoa in H. Doc. No. 334.
[11] Includes $200,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[12] Act continues available $108,000 of prior appropriations.
[13] Includes $100,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[14] Reflects transfer in the estimates of $267,000 from "Conservation and development of mineral resources" to "Health and safety."
[15] Includes $200,000 for activities previously carried under "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies," Office of Emergency Planning.
[16] Amount previously carried under "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies," Office of Emergency Planning.
[17] Includes $400,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[18] Includes $35,000 for an activity previously carried under "Grain for migratory waterfowl."
[19] Includes $3,500,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[20] For activities previously carried under "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Office of Saline Water."
[21] Includes $200,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[22] Includes $106,500 for activities previously carried under "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies," Office of Emergency Planning.
[23] Includes $85,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[24] Appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[25] Appropriation language provides for a grant to the Corporation of $669,000 to be derived by transfer from internal revenue collections appropriated to the Virgin Islands Government.

○

Calendar No. 1450

87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10802

[Report No. 1490]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 21 (legislative day, MARCH 14), 1962
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

MAY 10, 1962
Reported by Mr. HAYDEN, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, ~~$39,375,000~~ *$41,022,200*.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of access roads, acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads (other than on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands), and acquisition and construction of buildings and appurtenant facilities, $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such lands; an amount equivalent to 25 per centum of the

aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the amount appropriated herein for the purposes of this appropriation on lands administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture: *Provided further,* That the amount appropriated herein for road construction on lands other than those administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further,* That the amount appropriated herein is hereby made a reimbursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase of nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft; purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures; and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Provided,* That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection

with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands (other than expenditures made under the appropriation "Oregon and California grant lands") shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in subsection (c), title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876), of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California land-grant fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 754), of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund": *Provided further,* That appropriations herein made may be expended on a reimbursable basis for (1) surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and (2) protection and leasing of lands and mineral resources for the State of Alaska.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, as range improvements fees under section 3 of said Act, 25 per centum of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of said Act, and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the

Department of the Interior by Executive Order 10787, dated November 6, 1958, to remain available until expended.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

education and welfare services

For expenses necessary to provide education and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission), of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; ~~$81,000,000~~ *$82,827,000*.

resources management

For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law; ~~$34,300,000~~ *$34,677,000*.

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

For payment to the revolving fund for loans, as authorized by section 10 of the Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (25 U.S.C. 470), $4,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; ~~$52,000,000~~ *$55,550,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, and the Act of August 23, 1958 (72 Stat. 834),

~~$16,000,000~~ *$17,000,000,* to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices, ~~$4,000,000~~ *$4,350,000.*

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for expenses of exhibits; purchase of not to exceed two hundred and ~~twenty~~ *thirty* passenger motor vehicles (including ~~fifty~~ *seventy-one* for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year), of which two hundred shall be for replacement only, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; advance payments for service (including services which may extend beyond the current fiscal year) under contracts executed pursuant to the Act of June 4, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 452), the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), and legislation terminating Federal supervision over certain Indian tribes; purchase of ice for official use of employees; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated $3,000,000 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition, and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission); purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel, and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a curator for the Osage Museum, who shall be appointed with the approval of the Osage Tribal Council and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided,* That in addition

to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds, *other than judgment funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission or the Court of Claims*, may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary: *Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation or other tribal funds shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, if such acquisition results in the property being exempted from local taxation, except as provided for by the Act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 627).

National Park Service

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For expenses necessary for the management and protection of the areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service, including protection of lands in process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail plans and working drawings) and archeological values in river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin) ; ~~$25,425,000~~ *$26,034,320*.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service, $20,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451), of buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including the White House; the repair or replacement of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, or storm, or the construction of projects deferred by reason of the use of funds for such purposes; the acquisition of water rights; and not to exceed ~~$8,409,000~~ *$11,635,000* for the acquisition of lands, interest therein, improvements, and related personal property; ~~$40,000,000~~ *$44,526,000* to remain available until expended: *Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the condemnation of any land for Grand Teton National Park in the State of Wyoming.*

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, $29,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That none of the funds herein provided shall be expended for planning or construction on the following: Fort Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, except minor roads and trails; Great Falls Park, Virginia; Daingerfield Island Marina, Virginia; and extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the National Park Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, ~~$1,900,000~~ *$1,964,000*.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and ~~thirty-five~~ *fifty-two* passenger motor vehicles (of which one hundred and twenty-five are for replacement only), including not to exceed ~~fifty~~ *fifty-seven* for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limita-

tion for the current fiscal year; and the objects and purposes specified in the Acts of August 8, 1953 (16 U.S.C. 1b–1d), and July 1, 1955 (16 U.S.C. 18f).

Office of Territories

administration of territories

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and for the departmental administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C., secs. 1422, 1431a(c)); salaries of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secretary, the Government Comptroller, and the members of their immediate staffs as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1591, 72 Stat. 1095); compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. secs. 1421d(e), 1431a(c), and 1572e); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1431a(c)); grants to American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the houses of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa; $13,768,000: *Provided*, That the Territorial and local

governments herein provided for are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of Territories may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

For expenses necessary for the Department of the Interior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by joint resolution of July 18, 1947 (61 Stat. 397), and the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), including the expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and expenses of the Judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of governmental functions; $6,600,000: *Provided*, That the revolving fund for loans to locally owned private trading enterprises shall continue to be available during the fiscal year 1963: *Provided further*, That all financial transactions of the Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance

with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 834) : *Provided further*, That the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of article 6(2) of the Trusteeship Agreement approved by Congress: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any law, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to receive, during the current fiscal year, from the Department of Agriculture for distribution on the same basis as domestic distribution in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, without exchange of funds, such surplus food commodities as may be available pursuant to section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c) and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1431).

Alaska Railroad

ALASKA RAILROAD REVOLVING FUND

The Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall continue available until expended for the work authorized by law, including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit and development of industries or travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916 (5 U.S.C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided: *Provided*, That no employee shall be paid an annual salary out of said fund in excess of the salaries prescribed by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS–15, except the general manager of said railroad, one assistant general manager at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for GS–17, and five officers at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for grade GS–16.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Geological Survey

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by law (72 Stat. 837); *conduct investigations of marine geology and hydrology;* classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; control the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U.S.C. 715); and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; ~~$56,100,000~~ *$56,900,000*, of which $8,430,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed forty-nine passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; purchase of not to exceed one aircraft for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations and observation wells; expenses of U.S. National Committee on Geology and payment of contributions to the International Union on Geologic Sciences; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts.

BUREAU OF MINES

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; and developing synthetics and substitutes; ~~$26,550,000~~ *$26,887,000.*

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries, and controlling fires in coal deposits, as authorized by law, $8,158,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For the construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, $425,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional offices, $1,333,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only;

providing transportation services in isolated areas for employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils, and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrangements; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HELIUM PROPERTIES

The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treasury for payment to the helium production fund pursuant to section 12 (a) of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960 to carry out the provisions of the Act and contractual obligations thereunder, including helium purchases, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, ~~$6,000,000~~ *$20,000,000*, in addition to amounts heretofore authorized to be borrowed.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development, as authorized by law (74 Stat. 337), ~~$2,000,000~~ *$3,450,000*, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $300,000 shall be available for administration and supervision.

OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to provide a program for the discovery of the minerals reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions, by encouraging exploration for minerals, including administration of contracts entered into prior to June 30, 1958, under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, ~~$750,000~~ *$875,000*, including not to exceed $213,600 for administrative and technical services, to remain available until expended.

LEAD AND ZINC STABILIZATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out a lead and zinc mining stabilization program, including payments to producers, as authorized by the Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766), $2,450,000.

Office of Oil and Gas

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities with respect to oil and gas, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and its products, and natural gas, $531,000.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Office of the Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Commissioner, $364,000.

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

management and investigations of resources

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such resources; promotion of education and training of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions

related thereto, as authorized by law; ~~$14,600,000~~ *$15,981,500.*

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

(SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104 (k) of that Act, $300,000, which shall be available to purchase only those currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required for the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, ~~$7,900,000~~ *$8,473,000*, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86–516, to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, $750.000.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, including such expenses in the regional offices, $600,000.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a–631q), there are appropriated amounts not to exceed $1,998,000, to be derived from Pribilof Islands fund.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FISHERIES LOAN FUND

During the current fiscal year not to exceed $250,000 of the Fisheries loan fund shall be available for administrative expenses.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and functions related to wildlife management in California (16 U.S.C. 695–695c); and leasing and management of lands for the protection of the Florida Key deer; ~~$26,500,000~~ *$27,436,000.*

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein *(including improvements of the county road from Brigham City, Utah, to the headquarters Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge)*, ~~$4,900,000~~ *$8,033,800,* to remain available until expended.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

For an advance to the Migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, including such expenses in the regional offices, ~~$1,250,000~~ *$1,331,000.*

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred and ~~seventeen~~ *twenty-four* passenger motor vehicles of which ninety-two shall be for replacement only (including fifty for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the

current fiscal year) ; purchase of not to exceed two aircraft; not to exceed $30,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417) ; rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed $3 per man per day; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed $1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

Office of Saline Water

salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951–1958), authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, to remain available until expended.

~~$7,600,000~~ *$7,700,000*, of which not to exceed ~~$525,000~~ *$625,000* shall be available for administration and coordination during the current fiscal year.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of demonstration plants for the production of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, as authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958a–1958g), ~~$2,000,000~~ *$2,085,000*, of which not to exceed ~~$175,000~~ *$225,000* shall be available for administration.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, ~~$3,600,000~~ *$3,747,000*, and in addition, not to exceed $130,000 may be reimbursed or transferred to this appropriation from other accounts available to the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That hearing officers appointed for Indian probate work need not be appointed pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), as amended.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), including teletype rentals and service, not to exceed $2,000 for official

reception and representation expenses, and purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (medium sedan at not to exceed $3,000) for replacement only, ~~$3,350,000~~ *$3,340,000.*

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided,* That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: *Provided,* That appropriations made in this title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft or other equipment in con-

nection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title or in the Public Works Appropriations Act, 1963 shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), when authorized by the Secretary, at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, and in total amount not to exceed $175,000; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associa-

tions which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131 and D.C. Code 4–204).

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For expenses necessary for forest protection and utilization, as follows:

Forest land management: For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, including the administration, improvement, development, and management of lands under Forest Service administration, fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening such lands and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purposes, control of white pine blister rust and other forest diseases and insects on Federal and non-Federal lands; ~~$138,400,000~~ *$141,045,000*, of which $5,000,000 for fighting and preventing forest fires and $1,910,000 for insect and disease control shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to the extent necessary under the then

existing conditions: *Provided*, That not more than ~~$300,000~~ *$805,000* may be used for acquisition of land under the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513–519) : *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for "Cooperative range improvements", pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), may be advanced to this appropriation.

Forest research: For forest research at forest and range experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, as authorized by law; ~~$22,975,000~~ *$25,865,000*.

State and private forestry cooperation: For cooperation with States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in forest tree planting on non-Federal public and private lands, and in forest management and processing, and for advising timberland owners, associations, wood-using industries, and others in the application of forest management principles and processing of forest products, as authorized by law; ~~$15,800,000~~ *$16,405,000*.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, sections 203 and 205, relating to the construction and maintenance of forest development roads and trails, $37,500,000, to remain available until expended, for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to

authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203: *Provided,* That funds available under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), shall be merged with and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided further,* That not less than the amount made available under the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913, shall be expended under the provisions of such Act.

ACCESS ROADS

For acquiring by condemnation or otherwise additional roads needed for access to national forest lands in carrying out the Act of June 4, 1897, as amended (16 U.S.C. 471, 472, 475, 476, 551), $2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

For completion of the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 570; 16 U.S.C. 577c–h), as amended, by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be available without regard to the restriction in the proviso in section 1 of that Act.

SPECIAL ACTS

For the acquisition of land in the Cache National Forest, Utah, in accordance with the Act of May 11, 1938 (52

Stat. 347), as amended, $10,000, to be derived from forest receipts as authorized by said Act: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned.

For acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), as amended, authorizing annual appropriation of forest receipts for such purposes, from such receipts, $20,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of the national forest.

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests in accordance with section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), to be derived from grazing fees as authorized by said section, $700,000, to remain available until expended.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16 U.S.C. 568e), ~~$1,000,000~~ *$1,500,000*, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations available to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to exceed one hundred and ~~fifty-two~~ *seventy-nine* passenger motor vehicles, of which one hundred and thirty-seven shall be for replacement only, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three of which one shall be for replacement only; (b) employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not to exceed $25,000; (c) uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); (d) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (5 U.S.C. 565a); (e) expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 514);

and (f) acquisition of land and interests therein for sites for administrative purposes, pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a).

Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

Funds appropriated under this Act shall not be used for acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513–519, 521), where such land is not within the boundaries of a national forest nor shall these lands or lands authorized for purchase in Sanders County, Montana, be acquired without approval of the local government concerned.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $70,000.

Commission of Fine Arts

salaries and expenses

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), including

payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and Committee meetings of the Commission either within or outside the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the Commission, ~~$70,000~~ *$80,000.*

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), as amended; purchase of not to exceed twenty-six passenger motor vehicles, of which nineteen shall be for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the purposes set forth in sections 301 (with respect to research conducted at facilities financed by this appropriation), 321, 322 (d), 324, and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; ~~$55,284,000~~ *$57,000,000.*

CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of

portable buildings; purchase of trailers; and provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a); ~~$8,320,000~~ *$9,335,000*, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public and for payment in advance for publications available only upon that basis or available at a reduced price on prepublication orders.

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the func-

tions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U.S.C. 70), creating an Indian Claims Commission, $290,000, of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for expenses of travel.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71–71i), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $625,000.

LAND ACQUISITION, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK, PARKWAY, AND PLAYGROUND SYSTEM

For necessary expenses for the National Capital Planning Commission for acquisition of land for the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital, as authorized by the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended, to remain available until expended, $100,000 which shall be available for the purpose of section 1(a) thereof: *Provided,* That not exceeding $50,000 of the funds

available for land acquisition purposes shall be used during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses of the Commission (other than payments for land) in connection with land acquisition.

National Capital Transportation Agency

salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title II of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537), including payment in advance for membership in societies whose publications or services are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); ~~$3,350,000~~ *$2,825,000.*

land acquisition and construction

For necessary expenses for the National Capital Transportation Agency for acquisition of land for extra-wide median strips, or interests therein, and for incidental construction, for transit facilities, as authorized by law, $400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That such land purchases shall be subject to the advance approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches among the American Indians and the natives of lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United States, independently or in cooperation with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States, and the excavation and preservation of archeological remains; for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; for the administration, construction, and maintenance of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, Canal Zone, under the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1940, as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and administration of a national air museum as authorized by the Act of August 12, 1946 (20 U.S.C. 77); for expenses of

the National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board; including not to exceed $35,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), for other employees; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications; $10,900,000.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

For necessary expenses of planning, construction, remodeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the National Zoological Park, $1,275,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That such portion of this amount as may be necessary may be transferred to the District of Columbia (20 U.S.C. 81–84; 75 Stat. 779).

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

For the upkeep and operation of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as

authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators and uniforms, or allowances therefor for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and not to exceed $15,000 for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper; $2,054,000.

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

For grants to the State of Alaska to assist in accomplishing an orderly transition from Territorial status to statehood and to facilitate the assumption of responsibilities hitherto performed in Alaska by the Federal Government, and for expenses of providing Federal services or facilities in Alaska for an interim period, as authorized by law (73 Stat. 151), $3,000,000.

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), as amended (72 Stat. 1769), $100,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, RELATED AGENCIES

The per diem rate, unless an agency is otherwise limited by law to payment of a lesser per diem, paid from appropriations made available under this title for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), shall not exceed $75.

TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

REVOLVING FUND

For an additional amount for the revolving fund established under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, for advances to the Virgin Islands Corporation, as authorized by law (63 Stat. 350; 72 Stat. 1760), $200,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to it and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be

necessary in carrying out its programs as set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That not to exceed $180,000 shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the Corporation, covering the categories set forth in the 1963 budget estimates for such expenses.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963."

Passed the House of Representatives March 20, 1962.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 1450

87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10802

[Report No. 1490]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

MARCH 21 (legislative day, MARCH 14), 1962
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

MAY 10, 1962
Reported with amendments

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

29. PUBLIC WORKS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Robertson and Rep. Pelly inserting an article, "Two Billion Dollars Through the Back Door," criticizing "back-door spending approach" for public works programs. pp. A3682-3, A3701-2

30. FORESTS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Byrd, W. Va., inserting his statement before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in support of S. 1798, to provide for the establishment and administration of an Allegheny Parkway in the States of W. Va., Ky., and Md. pp. A3688-9

31. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Michel inserting an article, "Another Billion-Dollar Fizzle," criticizing the feed grain program. pp. A3693-4

    Extension of remarks of Rep. Edmondson inserting two prize-winning speeches by 4-H Club members. p. A3704

    Extension of remarks of Rep. Alger criticizing the Administration's farm program and inserting an article, "Kennedy To Get Farm If His Bill Is Passed." pp. A3715-6

32. WILDERNESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dingell inserting 2 articles, "Wilderness and the Self-Interest of Man," and "The De Facto Wilderness: What Is Its Place?" pp. A3697-8, A3728-30

33. FOREIGN TRADE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Bow stating that "numerous inaccurate statements have been made in connection with the current controversy on the U. S. foreign trade policy," and inserting an article, "Let's Look at the Facts." pp. A3699-701

34. MILK SANITATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Quie inserting a letter he received from the Minnesota State Board of Health in which the board announced its support of H. R. 50 and S. 212, the proposed National Milk Sanitation Act. p. A3720

BILLS INTRODUCED

35. SUGAR. H. R. 11792, by Rep. Boggs, H. R. 11800, by Rep. Rogers, Fla., and H. R. 11805, by Rep. Willis, to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to Agriculture Committee.

36. PERSONNEL. S. 3325, by Sen. Moss, to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

    H. R. 11806, by Rep. Dulski, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for increases in annuities, eliminate the option with respect to certain survivor annuities, and provide for interchange of credits between the civil service retirement system and the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Remarks of author. p. 7934

    H. R. 11807, by Rep. Dulski, to increase annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to equalize increases in annuity for certain employees retired before October 1, 1956, with annuities of other employees; to increase annuities whenever there is a general adjustment of salaries or the formulas for computing annuities of retiring employees is generally liberalized; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Remarks of author. p. 7934

    H. R. 11808, by Rep. Dulski, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

May 17, 1962

use of the Committee on Government Operations.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The title was amended, so as to read: "Resolution authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a report compiled by the Bureau of the Budget entitled 'Report to the President on Government Contracting for Research and Development'."

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF REVISED EDITION SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 98

The resolution (S. Res. 388) authorizing the printing as a Senate document of a revised edition of (an original resolution) Senate Document No. 98 entitled "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That a revised edition of Senate Document Numbered 98 of the Eighty-fourth Congress, entitled "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities" be printed as a Senate document.

PAYING GRATUITY TO ESTELLE A. ENGLAND

The resolution (S. Res. 339) to pay a gratuity to Estelle A. England was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Estelle A. England, mother of Shirley A. Preston, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to five months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

PAYING GRATUITY TO ROBERT I. PLOWMAN AND LUCY P. MUNRO

The resolution (S. Res. 340) to pay a gratuity to Robert I. Plowman and Lucy P. Munro was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Robert T. Plowman, son, and Lucy P. Munro, daughter of S. Rex Plowman, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Building at the time of his death, a sum to each equal to 3 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

The bill (H.R. 11261) to authorize an adequate White House Police force, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

That concludes the call of the calendar.

ORSOLINA CIANFLONE IALLONARDO

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1915) for the relief of Orsolina Cianflone Iallonardo, which were, after line 10, insert:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the Act of September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86-363), Mrs. Chow Chui Ha shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 4 of that Act, and the provisions of section 24(a)(7) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 657), shall be inapplicable in this case.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Act of April 13, 1962 (Private Law 87-346), Giuseppe Aniello shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 4 of the Act of September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86-363), and the provisions of section 24(a)(7) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 657), shall be inapplicable in this case.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act for the relief of Orsolina Cianflone Iallonardo, Mrs. Chow Chui Ha, and Giuseppe Aniello."

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on March 29, 1962, the Senate passed S. 1915 to enable the adopted daughter of a U.S. citizen to qualify for a nonquota immigrant visa under the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 86-363.

On May 15, 1962, the House of Representatives passed S. 1915, with amendments, to include two additional beneficiaries. The amendments will enable the adopted daughter of U.S. citizens and the son of a U.S. citizen to qualify for nonquota immigrant visas under the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 86-363.

Mr. President, these amendments are acceptable and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1915. This matter has been cleared with the leadership on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to.

ELISABETTA PICCIONI

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1271.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7777) for the relief of Elisabetta Piccioni.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the indulgence of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is on his feet, I should like at this time to have the pending business laid down.

I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1333, S. 3225.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3225) to improve and protect farm income, to reduce costs of farm programs to the Federal Government, to reduce the Federal Government's excessive stocks of agricultural commodities, to maintain reasonable and stable prices of agricultural commodities and products to consumers, to provide adequate supplies of agricultural commodities for domestic and foreign needs, to conserve natural resources, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no consideration of the bill this afternoon, unless a Senator desires to do so.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MEMBERS OF THE CALENDAR COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to pay my respects to the members of the calendar committees on both sides of the aisle and their staffs for the work they have done this afternoon in helping to clear the calendar to the extent that it has been cleared. They have done a good job.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECISION BY THE U.S. SUPREME COURT IN BROWN VERSUS BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today marks the eighth anniversary of the decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in Brown against Board of Education, the so-called school desegregation case.

Mr. President, it is tremendously interesting, I think, and should be of interest to the country, to see what has occurred in the light of the big to-do which has been made in this Chamber concerning the literacy test bill, which has gone down the drain.

This is the really critical element of the desegregation process. The desegregation of education, desegregation with respect to jobs, and desegregation with respect to housing are the three princi-

pal areas in which action is urgently required; yet the whole concentration of attention by the administration, I think quite wrongly, and the whole concentration of attention by the Congress has been upon voting matters, about which there should be very little dispute.

School desegregation has been allowed shamefully to lag. The 1961 report of the Civil Rights Commission specifies that in no uncertain terms, showing that the process has not even begun in biracial districts in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi and South Carolina, and has not begun in all but one district in Florida and in all but one district in Louisiana.

In this regard I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the "Conclusions of the Civil Rights Commission."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Nation's progress in removing the stultifying effects of segregation in the public elementary and secondary schools—North, South, East, and West—is slow indeed.

During the period 1959–61, only 44 school districts in the 17 Southern and border States initiated desegregation programs; 13 of these acted under court orders; 15 more were pressured into action by pending suits. Seven years after the Supreme Court decision in the School Segregation cases, 2,062 school districts in the South that enroll both white and Negro pupils had not even started to comply with the requirements of the Constitution. These include all districts in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina; all but one in Florida and one in Louisiana. Some of the 775 that have started to desegregate have barely begun a 12-year progression; others, by making all initial assignments by race and placing the burden of seeking transfer on Negro pupils—often under extensive pupil placement procedures—have kept at a minimum the number of Negroes in attendance at formerly white schools.

In the North and the West, where segregation by race, color, religion, or national origin is not officially countenanced, it exists in fact in many public schools. A Federal court decision in the New Rochelle, N.Y., case in January 1961 (affirmed by the court of appeals) which required the desegregation of a public school in a northern city, was probably the most significant single event affecting equal protection of the laws in public education since the Supreme Court's decision in the Little Rock case in 1958.

Legislative resistance to desegregation has continued in some Southern States, notably Louisiana. Others, such as Virginia and Georgia, have shifted from massive resistance to freedom of choice fortified by tuition grants. The former proved unconstitutional; the new strategy is now before the courts. The Prince Edward (Va.) case raised the question whether the closing of the public schools and financing the education of all children who seek it in private schools is an evasion of a court order to desegregate. In the St. Helena case the closing of a public school in accordance with Louisiana State law to avoid the necessity of desegregating has been successfully challenged as a denial of equal protection under the 14th amendment.

The Attorney General of the United States has been active in the New Orleans case to prevent nullification of constitutional principles by State action; to prevent evasion of the Federal court order to desegregate public schools; and to provide protection to Negro children assigned to formerly white schools. He has also filed a brief as amicus curiae in St. Helena. By invitation of the Federal court in the New Rochelle case, he filed a brief advising the court with regard to the order to be entered. Only in Prince Edward has the Federal court denied the Attorney General the right to intervene to protect the interests of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, even as late as this week, notwithstanding orders of the courts, New Orleans has decided to desegregate only its first grade, after 8 years.

It is also interesting to note—and I call this very strongly to the attention of the Government departments concerned—that so far as we know there have been no reports by any Government departments either on my bill, S. 2980, introduced for myself and a number of other Senators with relation to desegregation in the education field, or even upon what had been thought to be the administration bill, the Clark-Celler bill on the same subject.

Hence the even greater irony of a big conflict lasting 3 weeks on the literacy test bill, which died, while absolutely nothing is done in the Congress with respect to the desegregation of public education, the subject of one of the most historic decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court 8 years ago.

I think it behooves us to do something about the problem. I should be less than frank with the Senate if I did not say that I shall take counsel with the other Senators concerned about these civil rights matters—it is well known that we have always taken counsel without regard to party—in order to see whether the most critically important of all the measures, the measure which would give the Attorney General power to institute suits in representative civil rights cases, including school desegregation cases—yes, even in this election year—should be brought before the Senate for some consideration.

Mr. President, if we are to be frustrated in respect to civil rights legislation, in the face of a shameful lack of compliance with the highest law of the land, which is shown by the failure to act and the foot dragging in respect of desegregation of our school system, let us at least go down fighting on something which really rates and which really counts, like the authority of the Attorney General to start representative civil rights suits. Let the country know that the critical civil rights bill is the so-called part III bill. Nothing else should confuse the country as to what is really the basic issue at stake.

So, Mr. President, on this eighth anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in Brown against Board of Education, I rise to protest the inaction on the part of the Congress. I rise to point out that in wide areas of the country this fundamental national decision is not being observed but is being completely frustrated. We have no right to wonder why extra legal means—passive resistance, lack of confidence in our intention to honor the pledge of the Constitution—become the order of the day.

As I said the other day, when some untoward development does break out, in the form of violence or otherwise—we hope and pray it will not—let us look back to the kind of frustrating inaction which has taken place in respect to these weighty matters which affect so deeply the minds, consciences, and hearts of the people and which move them so deeply emotionally, in terms of the denial of their fundamental civil rights, to see whether we have done our duty.

Mr. President, I do not think we have. As I say, I shall consult with other Senators interested in this field in order to see, notwithstanding where we stand in the session and the fact that it is an election year, whether we should nonetheless bring the subject up for further consideration by the Congress.

CONSUMERS' PURCHASES OF BEEF

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on March 28, 1962, I inserted in the RECORD an article published in the March 1962 issue of McCall's magazine, entitled "Consumers' Purchases of Beef," written by Samuel Grafton, concerning consumers' purchases of beef, relating to the fat content as affected by the grading practices of the Department of Agriculture and the resultant consequences to be considered, the health of consumers. At that time I asked the Department of Agriculture for a report on the questions raised in Mr. Grafton's article. I have received the Department of Agriculture's response and another letter of comment from Mr. Grafton, and ask unanimous consent that the letters addressed to me by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman and by Mr. Samuel Grafton be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., April 23, 1962.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: The Department is glad to comply with your request in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28 for an evaluation of the article appearing in the March 1962 issue of McCall's magazine. "If You Are Buying the 'Better' Beef," by Samuel Grafton. This article does a distinct disservice to the consumer and to the entire beef industry. It contains serious errors and some false conclusions, and we are anxious to help correct misunderstandings that may result from this statement.

The central theme of the McCall's article is reflected in the statement that "the more fat distributed through the meat or curled lovingly around it the higher the grade it will be awarded." This idea is certainly untrue. The amount of fat on the outside of the beef carcass—and this is generally the location of the largest amount of fat—is not a grade-determining factor since it has no direct effect on the palatability of the lean. In fact, some carcasses in the U.S. Good grade have more outside fat than carcasses in the U.S. Prime grade.

With reference to factors used in determining grade, the article further states "the fat marbling is the decisive element." This is not the case. The maturity of the animal that produced the beef is the most important grade-determining factor. However, among carcasses from animals of the same age, the amount of marbling, or fat dis-

June 6, 1962

18. APPROPRIATIONS. Sen. Williams, Del., for himself and Sen. Lausche, submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to H. R. 10802, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1963. p. 9107

19. WATER RESOURCES. Received from the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, a report on the Chowchilla River Basin, Calif. p. 9107

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

20. TRANSPORTATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Van Zandt inserting an article, "Washington Reports -- J. F. K.'s Transportation Proposals Meet Rail Approval." pp. A4149-50

Extension of remarks of Rep. Van Zandt inserting his article, "A Call For United Rail Action." pp. A4164-5

21. ELECTRIFICATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Hruska inserting several prize-winning essays on the value or rural electrification. pp. A4153-4

22. AUTOMATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Brademas inserting a report of the 21st American Assembly, "The Challenge and the Promise of Technology." pp. A4162-4

23. WILDERNESS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Saylor urging the passage of the proposed Wilderness Act and inserting an article, "Outdoor Recreation Review." pp. 4132-4

24. CONSERVATION; RESEARCH. Extension of remarks of Rep. Thomson, Wis., inserting a resolution of the Wisconsin Association of Soil and Water Conservation District Supervisors supporting soil and water conservation research programs. p. A4137

25. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Goodling criticizing the decrease in family farms and inserting an article criticizing the farm program, "Our Agricultural Failure." p. A4138

26. SURPLUS COMMODITIES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Kelly commending and summarizing briefly the main provisions of Public Law 480 and the extent of the food-for-peace programs. pp. A4147-9

BILLS INTRODUCED

27. PERSONNEL. H. R. 12033, by Rep. Merrow, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

H. R. 12040, by Rep. Murray, to define the term "child" for lump-sum payment purposes under the Civil Service Retirement Act; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

28. SUGAR. H. R. 12034, by Rep. Nelsen, to amend section 408 of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to Agriculture Committee.

29. FORESTS. S. 3379, by Sen. Williams, Del., relating to mining claims on lands within the national forests; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 9104-5

000

Agreed to a unanimous consent agreement limiting debate on any amendment to two hours and limiting debate on final passage of the bill to four hours. pp. 9125-6

Sens. Gruening, Hickenlooper, Cotton, Cooper, and Capehart submitted amendments intended to be proposed to this bill. p. 9107

Sen. Pell inserted a chart on U. S. economic assistance to Latin America showing obligations and loan authorizations from July 1, 1961, to April 30, 1962. pp. 9114-5

13. THE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE voted to report (but did not actually report) the following bills: pp. D437-8

H. R. 8434, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey a parcel of forest land to the city of Mount Shasta, Calif.

H. R. 9736, to permit States which have been cooperating with the Federal Government in the production of forest tree seedlings for planting on conservation reserve land to continue to use for related programs the facilities, equipment, etc., provided cooperatively by the Federal Government for the production of such seedlings.

S. 3064, with amendment, to authorize additional appropriations annually to keep the national survey of forest resources current.

H. R. 10374, to amend Sec. 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 so as to reduce the revolving fund available for subscriptions to capital stock of the banks for cooperatives.

H. R. 4083, to reduce the frequency of reports required of the Veterans' Administration on the use of surplus dairy products.

S. 3062, to amend the Soil Bank Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the harvesting of hay on conservation reserve acreage to alleviate hardship from natural disaster.

H. R. 4939, to provide for the conveyance by the Farmers Home Administration of all right, title, and interest of the U. S. in a tract of land in Jasper County, Ga., to the Jasper County Board of Education.

H. R. 7866, to extend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

H. R. 8050, to prohibit the importation of all honeybees of the genus Apis in the adult stage except for research purposes by this Department as the Secretary shall determine.

14. SOVIET AGRICULTURE. Sen. Hruska inserted a condensation of an analysis prepared in this Department on the problems of Soviet Agriculture. pp. 9112-3

15. FORESTRY. Sen. Gruening discussed problems of the lumber industry in Alaska, urged relief for the industry pending completion of a study of the problem, and inserted a telegram he received from the president of the Alaska Lumbermen's Association on the matter. pp. 9129-30

16. NATIONAL PARKS. Sen. Moss urged adoption of a policy of multiple use management for the national parks, stating that he was convinced "that only when we permit limited secondary use of the lands within the national parks and seashores ... can we expand our park system to the extent necessary to meet our growing needs for outdoor recreation." Sens. Metcalf and Yarborough commended his statement. pp. 9130-2

17. EXPORT CONTROL. Received from Commerce the quarterly report on export control. p. 9102.

be done on the congressional level for the 1962 campaign with fairness to the minor party candidates and by giving the people the kind of debate between major candidates to which they are entitled.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 196) to amend section 315(a) of the Federal Communications Act of 1934, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself and Mr. LAUSCHE) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GRUENING submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2996) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mr. LAUSCHE) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 2996, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2996, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. COOPER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2996, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2996, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON CHOWCHILLA RIVER BASIN, CALIF. (S. DOC. NO. 98)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated January 17, 1962, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the reports on the Chowchilla River Basin, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CAPITOL HILL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3180) to establish the Capitol Hill National Historical Park and to provide for the protection and preservation of its historic character, dignity, and environment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF BEN C. GREEN, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, June 15, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Ben C. Green, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge, northern district of Ohio.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN D. BUTZNER, JR., TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, June 13, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of John D. Butzner, Jr,. of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Virginia, vice Albert V. Bryan, elevated.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 6, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 315. An act for the relief of Dr. Ting-Wa Wong;

S. 1962. An act for the relief of Kenneth David Wooden;

S. 2011. An act for the relief of Antonia Longfield-Smith; and

S. 2099. An act for the relief of Tina Jane Beland.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

Editorial entitled "Senator Henry Fountain Ashurst," written by William R. Mathews, editor of the Arizona Daily Star, and published in the June 3, 1962, edition of that newspaper.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Editorial entitled "Business Take Courage," published in the Charleston (S.C.) News & Courier of May 31, 1962.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorial entitled "In the Soviet Barnyard," published in the New York Times on June 4, 1962.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

Article entitled "Former Chief Justice John E. Hickman Dies," published in the Texas Bar Journal, issue of May 1962.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "The Indians Are Coming!" written by Robert Savage and published in a recent edition of the Extension magazine of Chicago.

Column entitled "A Good Resolution," written by Lyle C. Wilson, published in the Washington, D.C. Daily News of June 6, 1962.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

Sundry essays on the subject of the value of rural electrification in the home community, entered in an essay contest sponsored by the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Transcript of broadcast of Edward P. Morgan on May 16, 1962.

JUSTICE SUSIE SHARP, NORTH CAROLINA'S FIRST WOMAN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the announcement of another North Carolina "first" came recently when Gov. Terry Sanford appointed, for the first time, a woman as associate justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court.

It is with a deep sense of pride and happiness that I can say that my distinguished friend, Miss Justice Susie Marshall Sharp, of Reidsville, is the new appointee. Miss Justice Sharp has a long line of notable achievements that started as the daughter of the prominent Reidsville, N.C., attorney and dean of the Rockingham County, N.C., bar, James Madison Sharp. After her student days at the University of North Carolina, where she served as editor of the North Carolina Law Review, Miss Sharp has gone on to receive acclaim and several firsts in North Carolina history. Notable among these was her apopintment as city attorney for Reidsville. She was the first woman to hold that post in any North Carolina city. Judge Sharp served in that capacity for 10 years. In 1949, our late colleague, W. Kerr Scott, who, at that time, was Governor of North Carolina, named her to the bench of the State superior court, where she served

outstandingly. I should like to share with my colleagues in the Senate several newspaper articles. One of them appeared in the March 11, 1962, edition of the Greensboro Daily News. Two other items are from the Charlotte Observer; one is a news article published on March 10; the other is an editorial published on March 11. I ask unanimous consent that these articles and the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensboro Daily News, Mar. 11, 1962]

NO. 7 IS SIGNIFICANT IN MISS SUSIE'S LIFE

(By W. C. Burton)

REIDSVILLE, March 10.—Susie Sharp of Reidsville, was the first of seven children born to her parents and she was born on the 7th day of the 7th month of the 7th year of this century. "If you are a mystic," she says, "that may mean something."

Perhaps it does. She was destined to make history on at least two levels of her chosen field, the law. She was North Carolina's first—and still only—woman named to the State's superior court bench.

On Friday afternoon she became the first woman ever named to the North Carolina State Supreme Court. The appointment was made by Governor Sanford upon the resignation of the chief justice resulting in a step-up of the other members and a vacancy to fill.

Junior Justice Sharp does not yet know when the term of her appointment expires. When it does she will be, as the ballot box term has it, "up for election."

Few women have ever achieved such an office. Judge Florence Allen, named in 1922 to Ohio's Supreme Court, later a Federal judge, and now retired, was a pioneer. Research (admittedly limited in time and source material) has produced only one other, Justice Anne X. Alpern of Pennsylvania Supreme Court, who was named to the position last August.

Women all over North Carolina, and the Nation, probably were set up over the appointment. Her wonderful mother was, of course, as proud as could be, though she proceeded in her unruffled fashion to answer the constantly jangling telephone at the Sharp home, 629 Lindsey Street, and to go about getting supper.

Calls and telegrams of congratulations poured in, and Justice Sharp was rushing to make a dinner engagement. Reporters interrupted her to ask innumerable questions over the long-distance wire, and I waited for a brief interval in which to snap some new pictures. "You'll probably be glad when things settle down a little," I said. But, "Judge Susie" said, "No, this is the exciting part of it; this is all fun."

LIKES HER WORK

She admits she likes being a judge. It carries with it a considerable and ever-present burden of responsibility, but, she says, "The work is interesting; I meet and work with interesting people all over the State." With her record and standing in her profession, she should have no trouble remaining a justice.

She has tried to follow the advice given her by her late father, and one-time law partner. On the morning she left the house to open her first term of superior court, back in 1949, her father called to her from the porch. "Judge Susie" feels her father knew she needed brief and direct encouragement at that point, particularly toward keeping a firm hand and an orderly court. "Plow a straight furrow," called the father of the fledgling judge, "and remember, you're the boss."

Susie Marshall Sharp was born in Rocky Mount, in Nash County, where her parents were temporarily situated. They soon came back to Rockingham, and her father began his law practice in Stoneville. They then moved to Madison, and soon to Reidsville, where they remained.

FATHER MADISON DEAN OF BAR

Her father, James Marshall Sharp, was for years dean of the Rockingham County bar. He died in 1952, at the page of 75. Her mother was the former Annie Blackwell, of Vance County. One of Mrs. Sharp's uncles, A. R. Wortham, was a lawyer in Henderson.

When Susie entered the Reidsville public schools she enrolled in the second grade, taught by Miss Dora Coates. Like all former pupils of this gentle educator, now retired, Susie remembers her as an inspired teacher.

Susie was graduated from Reidsville High School in 1924 as salutatorian of her class. The classmate who was valedictorian by a fraction (records had to be traced back to the sixth grade to settle the title) was Dillard S. Gardner. Later they were classmates in the law school of the University of North Carolina. Now they will be closely associated again for Gardner is now research librarian of the North Carolina Supreme Court.

Incidentally class salutatorian is almost a traditional title in the Sharp family. Of the seven children, four achieved this title in Reidsville High School. The others were Annie Hill (now Mrs. Fred Klenner of Reidsville), Louise, who is Lt. Comdr. Louise W. Sharp, U.S. Navy Nurse Corps now stationed at a Marine hospital at Cherry Point, and Tommy, Thomas A. Sharp, now of Rowayton, Conn., director of general services for Remington-Rand Univac division of Sperry Rand Corp. at South Norwalk.

"Sally, Florence and 'Kits' had more important things to think about," says Susie. The fact is all the Sharp children could be honestly called "bright as buttons." Sally was Mrs. L. A. Taylor of Poplar Bluff, Mo., where she died in 1953. (Her husband died a few years later and their two sons live in Reidsville with their grandmother and Aunt Susie. Lawrence A. Taylor is a third-year medical student at the University of North Carolina. James M. Taylor is a freshman at the university.) Florence is now Mrs. R. W. Newsom of Oldtown and a teacher in Forsyth's Northwest High School. "Kits" is now Dr. James Vance Sharp, a surgeon in Reidsville.

MOVED TOWARD LAW

In high school Susie went out for the triangular debates and this is what moved her toward the law. She was an excellent debater. Her father was a lawyer. So people said to Susie, "You ought to be a lawyer." "After a while," says Susie, "I just went along with it."

High school debating also introduced her to a man who has remained her close friend and colleague. Miss Mary Wilson Brown, a Caswell native and an English teacher in Reidsville High School, was put in charge of the debating teams. She called on a Caswell cousin, newly come to town to practice law, for help in coaching the teams. This was Allen H. Gwyn, now a veteran superior court judge. Of their early coach-student relationship, Justice Sharp says, "He praised me to the skies and I worked like a dog." Obviously the method was effective.

Two high school teachers are remembered gratefully by the new justice as having helped along the way. They were Miss Janie Stacy, now Mrs. J. Minor Gwynn of Chapel Hill, and Miss Pauline Whitley, now retired, of Winston-Salem.

WROTE ON FLAPPERS

Susie entered Women's College, University of North Carolina, in Greensboro (then North Carolina College for Women) in the fall of 1924, took her first two college years there. Her most vivid Woman's College recollections, it happens, are the "inspired history teaching" of the late Dr. W. C. Jackson, for many years chancellor of Woman's College and "getting an A-plus on an English source theme on "Flappers and Flapperism." She laughs, "I don't remember what I wrote about flappers, but I expect I viewed with alarm."

In the University of North Carolina Law School she again came under the guidance of another gifted Coates. Prof. Albert Coates, brother of her second-grade teacher, later founded and now directs the Institute of Government at Chapel Hill. In those days he was the challenging and imaginative professor of criminal law in the law school.

Susie was a vigorous participant in a mock court known on the campus as Albert Coates' Moot Court. She remembers giving the constitutionality of North Carolina's then new bad check law a going over in the moot court. She and George M. Shaw, now a lawyer in New York, argued for the new law. Their adversaries were Algernon L. Butler, now judge of the Federal court, Eastern North Carolina District, and Jefferson B. Fordham, now dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School.

EDITS LAW REVIEW

At Chapel Hill, Susie became a student editor of the North Carolina Law Review, was made a member of the Order of the Coif, an honorary legal fraternity more stringent in its demands than even Phi Beta Kappa. She was the only girl in a class of 60 law students.

Licensed and admitted to the bar in 1928, the year before she took her LL.B. degree, Susie formed the partnership of Sharp & Sharp with her father and soon earned high respect in the field.

They made a good team. Sharp, known as "Mr. Jim" all over the county, was a scrappy lawyer who gave his best to every client in court. Susie was a skillful hand at the books and briefs.

She was also quick witted in emergencies. Once a woman came to her seeking a divorce. Upon investigation, Susie found that the marriage her client desired to sunder was a common-law marriage only. "Well I want some kind of paper sayin' we's separated and dividing our propity," the woman insisted. Susie settled the matter neatly with a dissolution of partnership.

WANTED TO SEE

Once a Negro man came into the office and said "I want to see de lady lawyer."

"What can I do for you?" asked the "lady lawyer."

"Nuthing," said the man, staring hard, "I jus' heard they had one up here an' I wanted to see her."

Clients began to say "I've got Mr. Sharp and Miss Susie." It was recognition she was proud to receive.

Justice Sharp has wavered from the law only once. During her Woman's College years she became entranced by chemistry. The test tubes failed to hold her but she still finds chemistry fascinating.

LONGEST CASE

Appointed a special judge of the Superior Court in 1949 by Gov. Kerr Scott, Judge Sharp held court in 64 of the 100 counties during the next dozen years. The longest case she tried ran 2 weeks. It was the trial in Guilford County of N. C. Webster, who was convicted of embezzling funds while burser of A. & T. College. The case took 2 weeks—and Webster died soon after, never having begun his sentence. She has two capital cases in which the defendants were executed, both, as it happens, in Guilford.

From her years on the superior court bench, Judge Sharp cherishes a compliment paid her by Atty. Will A. Lucas of Wilson.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued June 11, 1962
For actions of June 8, 1962
87th-2d, No. 93

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....9	Flood control.....3	Stockpiling.....4
Appropriations.....2	Foreign trade.....14	Taxation.....7
Auditing.....11	Forest Service.....2	Territories.....8
Consumer Counsel.....13	Mining.....10	Trade fairs.....14
Expenditures.....12	Reclamation.....6	Virgin Islands.....8
Farm program.....1	Small business.....5	Watersheds.....3

SENATE

1. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Williams, Del., criticized the Administration's farm program, pointing out various payments to non-farmers under the feed-grains program. p. 9295

2. APPROPRIATIONS. The Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1963, H. R. 10802, was made the unfinished business. p. 9284

The Appropriations Committee voted to report with amendments (but did not actually report) H. R. 11289, the Defense appropriation bill for 1963. p. D450

3. FLOOD CONTROL. Received from this Department a proposed bill "to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended"; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. The proposed legislation is the same as the provisions on this subject in H. R. 11222, the farm bill, as reported by the House Agriculture Committee. p. 9262

4. STOCKPILING. Received from GAO a report on the review of policies and procedures for the use of excess stockpiled materials by Federal agencies. p. 9262

5. SMALL BUSINESS. At the request of Sen. Keating, passed over S. 2970, to increase the revolving fund under the Small Business Act. p. 9271

6. RECLAMATION. Sen. Goldwater urged House approval of the measure to allow the construction of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colo. p. 9274

7. TAXATION. Sen. Proxmire criticized the President's proposed tax cut and discussed the budget. pp. 9285-8

8. TERRITORIES. The Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendment S. 2429, to revise the boundaries of the Virgin Islands National Park. p. D450

9. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 11. p. 9300

HOUSE

10. MINING. The Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 10773, to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed. p. D451

11. AUDITING. H. Doc. 371 is "a compilation of General Accounting Office findings and recommendations for improving Government operations" and relates mainly to the fiscal year 1961. The purpose of the report, as stated by GAO in its letter of submission, is "to provide the Congress with a convenient summary showi the nature, extent, and variety of matters which the General Accounting Office examines into in its audit activities." A small number of copies of this document are available for lending by the Division of Legislative Reporting.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

12. EXPENDITURES. Extension of remarks of Sen. Thurmond inserting an article, "Price of Paternalism," and stating that it is "concerned with Sen. Harry Byrd's revelation last week that the U. S. Government has financial obligations totaling $1¼ trillion." p. A4229

13. CONSUMER COUNSEL. Extension of remarks of Rep. George Miller, Calif., inserting a report of the Calif. Consumer Counsel describing the purposes and programs of the counsel. pp. A4229-30

BILLS INTRODUCED

14. FOREIGN TRADE. S. 3389, by Sen. Engle, to promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs; to Commerce Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 9262-3

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS:
June 11: Establishment of Great Basin National Park, Nev. (including transfer of national forest lands), H. Interior (Florance and Grover, FS, to testify).
Quality stabilization bills, H. Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

oOo

For supplemental information or copies of legislative material referred to, USDA personnel in Washington may call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 117-E.

INTERNATIONAL

Commission Internationale pour la Protection des Regions Alpines, Geneve.

Commission des Reserves Naturelles (CNR) du Groupement Europeen des Ardennes et de l'Eifel, Bruxelles.

International Committee for Bird Preservation, London.

International Youth Federation for the Study and Conservation of Nature, Amsterdam.

Standing Committee on Pacific Conservation, Wellington.

Union Internationale des Directeurs de Jardins Zoologiques, Anvers.

TUNISIA

Gouvernement de la Republique de Tunisie Ministre des Affaires Etrangeres, Tunis.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, among the organizations in the United States which are members of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature are such scientific organizations as the American Museum of Natural History, the American Nature Association, the Garden Clubs of America, the National Parks Association, the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Wildlife Society, and the Wildlife Management Institute.

More than 30 U.S. conservation and scientific societies are members of the international organization. When the bill was considered by the committee, it was suggested that in order to have the U.S. Government cooperate with the International Conference and provide for assistance to the First World Conference on National Parks, the Secretary of the Interior be authorized to match up to $100,000 of a $200,000 budget. Subsequently, the sponsors of the conference suggested that the budget could be reduced from $200,000 to $148,000. The reports on the bill from various organizations suggested that the Government appropriate $74,000. However, in considering the bill and in discussing some of the items suggested in the budget which appear on page 5 of the report, the committee felt that the sponsoring organizations, such as the National Wildlife Society, and others, should assume the cost of the Secretariat, for instance, and also assume some of the costs of travel, including foreign travel, in order to promote attendance at the Conference.

However, because this will be an international conference, and the United States will be the host nation, it was felt by the committee that such items as contractual services for translating machines, the publication of proceedings, and printing and duplicating at the Conference, should be sponsored and taken care of by the Federal Government.

An important part of this item will be the National Park Service exhibit, which will cost $20,000. The Conference will be held in connection with the Century of Progress exhibit in Seattle.

The sponsoring organizations have already raised almost $100,000. They have established the Secretariat and have gone ahead with their part of the work. So the initial groundwork has been laid, and the Conference will be held.

In order to enable the United States to participate to the fullest extent and to demonstrate our national parks exhibit at the Conference, the committee felt it was necessary to participate up to the amount of $50,000.

It is a great honor for the United States, and a recognition of our leadership in the conservation of natural resources and the development of national parks, to have the Conference held in this country. I take special pride in the fact that my State, in which is located Glacier National Park, and also the Waterton International Peace Park, will be one of the places to be visited on the journey. The 150 foreign delegates will be able to see how the State of Montana participates with the sovereign nation of Canada in the development of the great park at Glacier and the Waterton International Peace Park.

The United States is not a member of the international organization, because it is believed that under our concept of sovereignty our Government should only become a member of organizations to which sovereign states belong. Not only do sovereign nations belong to the Conference on National Parks, but independent and private organizations belong, as well. Nevertheless, the United States has participated in their activities by sending our representatives or delegates to conferences throughout the world. Therefore, it is felt that the United States should cooperate in this venture, and that the Secretary of the Interior should do his best to make the First World Conference on National Parks a success.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I correctly under that the United States is not a member of this organization?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I correctly understand that the proposed appropriation is to pay for the attendance expenses of some of the international members who will come to the Conference?

Mr. METCALF. No. As originally presented by the members of the steering committee and the members of the First World Conference on National Parks, the bill provided that the United States would match expenses with them. But upon consideration, the committee reduced the appropriation from $100,000 to $74,000, and now to $50,000, the reason being that it was felt that the United States, as a nonmember of the group, should not participate in the payment of the expenses.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then do I correctly understand that no part of the appropriation will be used for the payment of salaries or transportation expenses of anyone other than a Government employee?

Mr. METCALF. As I understand, there will be no payment of salaries. It is proposed to have the Government pay the special fees for interpreters, for example; to pay for the contractual service for the employment of interpreters of the proceedings of the Conference. Also, it is proposed to have the Government pay for the publication of the proceedings and, consequently, the salaries of the personnel who operate the printing and the duplicating apparatus at the Conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does the Senator have a breakdown, which can be placed in the RECORD, of how the $50,000 is proposed to be spent?

Mr. METCALF. Yes; I refer the Senator to page 5 of the report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On page 5, the total amount shown as proposed to be expended is $148,000; the bill mentions $50,000.

Mr. METCALF. That is correct.

Printing, duplicating, and distributing Conference documents, $11,000.

Contractual services, including translations, $5,000.

Publication of proceedings, $10,000.

Simultaneous interpretation equipment, $4,500.

The cost of the National Park Service exhibit—our own exhibit—$20,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The total amount, as I figure it, is $50,500. How does the Senator arrive at $50,000?

Mr. METCALF. $11,000, $5,000, $10,000, $4,500, and $20,000 total $50,500. The committee rounded the figure to $50,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Do I correctly understand that those items are the only parts of the total expense which the Government will be required to pay under the proposal?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct. The other organization has now raised enough money to pay for the services of the secretariat, domestic travel, foreign travel to promote attendance, and so forth.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Why should the U.S. Government pay all those particular expenses for an organization of which our Government is not a member?

Mr. METCALF. The United States has participated at all times in the conferences of this organization. The United States would be a member of the organization if it were not for the fact that it is the policy of the United States, as is set forth in the report, not to become a member of an organization which has as its members both private organizations and sovereign states. But I have constantly and consistently participated, and we have built this up. Conferences have been held at Sierra Leone and other places; I have a list of half a dozen conferences which have been held.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I understand that. Since we are not a member, why should we have to pay all the expenses?

Mr. METCALF. Because we are the host nation. There are many difficulties of transportation and of language which the other nations confront when the meeting is held in our country; and we feel that as the host Nation, we should take care of the expenses of the Conference. Whoever is the host nation for the next one will be expected to take care of the expenses there.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is a reasonable explanation if that is the usual custom.

I understand that there have been four or five conferences——

Mr. METCALF. There have been four or five conferences of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, but this is to be the First World Conference on National Parks.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Where were the other conferences held; and did the host countries assume all the expenses just as it is proposed that our country now do?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct. We had no expenses in the previous conferences of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. The host nations at those conferences took care of those expenses.

But this is to be a much larger conference than those, because this will be the First World Conference on National Parks; and representatives of various independent, private organizations, such as wildlife organizations, are coming from their own countries, as the delegates from those sovereign states.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is all very fine.

At the previous conferences was an assessment for these comparable charges made against the organizations attending, or did the country in which the conference was held pay the costs in their entirety, as the host country?

Mr. METCALF. I wish to emphasize that this is the First World Conference on National Parks which will be participated in by these unofficial organizations. This is to be the first international conference of this sort. So no nation could previously have participated as a host nation. We are the host nation in this first Conference; and in my opinion it is in recognition of our leadership that we have been chosen as the one to sponsor this first International Conference.

The International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources is a part of the UNESCO organizations, and the other conferences have been conferences of delegates from the various member states—70 or 80 of them—rather than the 300 whom we anticipate to attend this Conference. I cannot state whether the others were paid for by assessments on UNESCO, or just how they were paid. But the United States has never participated in the payment of the expenses of holding such a conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That may be true. But I do not think we should establish the precedent of paying all the expenses of holding one of these conferences—particularly when we are not a member and when the Conference includes private organizations—unless that is the custom when the conferences are held in other countries.

Mr. METCALF. We are to establish the precedent of paying, as the host nation, the special costs to be incurred because it is an international conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But will the costs be assumed by the respective countries in which the future conferences are to be held, wherever they are held?

Mr. METCALF. I would hope that the next host nation would follow the precedent which is being established by the United States, and that for the Second World Conference on National Parks it would participate in taking care of the housekeeping expenses arising as the result of holding the Conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What would the other expenses be? In the bill I notice that the first figure suggested was $200,000, and now it would be changed to $50,000; but on page 5 of the committee report the total is $148,000. Let me ask, Who is jockeying around the figures? If $50,000 is adequate in order to do the job as a proper host country, where did the other figures come from? The continual changing of the figures for the same conference puzzles me. Have they simply been pulled out of thin air?

Mr. METCALF. There has not been any jockeying around of the figures or pulling them out of thin air. The first estimate was $200,000; and it was hoped that the Government of the United States, the host nation, would assume half of the burden. But then the budget was cut, in a supplemental letter, to $148,000; and those are the items to which I referred, which appear on page 5 of the report, in the table from which I read.

Then a steering committee was established, under Harold J. Coolidge and C. R. Gutermuth, who are representatives of wildlife, conservation, and natural resources organizations in the United States; and from these 33 scientific, conservation, and natural resources organizations, whose names I have stated for the RECORD, they have raised the balance of the money—a little over $100,000—that is necessary in order to establish the secretariat and to lay the plans for the Conference and to keep this thing underway. That has been done by private contributions to those private organizations. So at the time of the hearing, they said that instead of proceeding on the basis of a $70,000 contribution or an even larger one, from the Federal Government, they would be able to get along with $50,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I emphasize that if this were to be a bona fide international conference of which we were a member, we would pay our proportionate part. But I notice in the original proposal the inclusion of per diem expenses of employees, some of whom may not be employees in this country. This Conference seems to have the appearance, instead of being a conference to promote worldwide interest in national parks, of being an international junket for which we would pick up the tab.

I am sufficiently skeptical about it so that I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. METCALF. I assure the Senator from Delaware that none of the money contributed by the United States will go for travel or for salaries of the secretariat or for the salaries or wages of such persons, other than the ordinary translators and assistants who will be at Seattle. The others, to whom the Senator from Delaware has referred, have now been cut out, and those expenses will be raised by private contributions.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That should be done.

Of course, there may not be too much difference insofar as the part paid by the United States is concerned, between the original budget and the budget as it will finally stand.

Mr. METCALF. But $70,000 has already been raised, and before the year is over, these private organizations will raise the rest of the money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall not debate the matter further. However, in the absence of more evidence than we have now it seems that this would establish a precedent for the United States to pay expenses of an organization of which it is not a member; and there is no evidence to show that in the future the other host countries would pay similar expenses.

I think we should pay our share of the expenses of any organization of which we are a member, but I do not think we should play Santa Claus in regard to the expenses of an organization of which we are not a member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments, which, without objection, will be considered en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2164) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1450, H.R. 10802.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued June 12, 1962
For actions of June 11, 1962
87th-2d, No. 94

CONTENTS

Access roads.....7
Acreage Allotments....8,32
Air pollution.....13
Appropriations.....7,12,31
Casein.....3
Communications.....14
Communist agriculture...11
Conservation.....18
Contracts.....5
Education.....28
Electrification.....17
Export control.....6
Extension education.....28
Education.....19
Farm labor.....15
Farm program.....9,25
Food shipments.....11,20
Food surplus.....11,20,27
Foreign aid.....11,20
Foreign trade....6,10,23,30
Forest Service.....7
Marketing quotas.....8,32
Natural resources.....18
Property.....31
Public works.....4
Purchasing.....31
Radiation.....21
Reclamation.....33
School lunch.....29
Stockpiling.....22
Tariffs.....3
Taxation.....2
Tobacco.....16,26
Water resources.....24
Watersheds.....1
Wheat.....8,32

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed measure to defer proclamation of wheat acreage allotments. Senate debated Interior appropriation bill. Sens. Miller and Williams, Del., charged mismanagement of farm program.

HOUSE

1. WATERSHEDS. Received from this Department a proposed bill "to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended"; to Agriculture Committee. The proposed legislation is the same as the provisions on this subject in H. R. 11222, the farm bill, as reported by the House Agriculture Committee. p. 9307

2. TAXATION. Rep. Harsha inserted a letter from the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service clarifying a statement made by the Commissioner in regard to unreported taxable income by farmers. pp. 9302-3

3. TARIFFS. The Ways and Means Committee reported with amendments H. R. 10928, to transfer casein or lactarene to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930 (H. Rept. 1791). p. 9308

4. PUBLIC WORKS. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment S. J. Res. 68, providing for the designation of the week commencing October 1, 1961, as "National Public Works Week" (H. Rept. 1796). p. 9308

5. CONTRACTS. Subcommittee No. 1 of the Banking and Currency Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 11500, to extend the

Defense Production Act of 1950. p. D456

6. EXPORT CONTROL. Subcommittee No. 1 of the Banking and Currency Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 11309, to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports. p. D456

SENATE

7. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 10802 (pp. 9336, 9341-70, 9385-8, 9390). Agreed to the committee amendments en bloc and the bill as amended is considered original text for the purpose of further amendment (pp. 9341-2). Pending at adjournment was a proposed amendment by Sen. Magnuson to increase from $2 million to $6 million the amount for acquiring additional roads needed for access to national forest lands (pp. 9386-8).

Sen. Carroll submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to this bill. p. 9312

8. WHEAT. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 198, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to defer until July 15, 1962, the proclamation of marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1963 crop of wheat, and to defer until August 25, 1962, the referendum with respect to marketing quotas for this crop of wheat (pp. 9311-2). Sen. Ellender introduced the resolution earlier in the day (p. 9311).

9. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Miller referred to a case in Iowa in which "an Iowa grain elevator operator literally stole grain right out from under the nose of an Agriculture Department investigator," charged that this involved "what I would call incredible mismanagement on the part of the Department of Agriculture", and urged Congressional investigation of the case. Sen. Williams, Del., commended Sen. Miller's statement. pp. 9388-90

Sen. Mundt inserted an address by Dr. Byerly, Administrator of CSESS, at the dedication of the Northern Grain Insects Laboratory at State College, Brookings, S. Dak., explaining the organization and functions of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. pp. 9333-5

10. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen Young, O., commended and urged enactment of the Administration's proposed trade expansion bill, stating that it would increase U. S. exports and the sale of agricultural commodities. p. 9340

11. COMMUNIST AGRICULTURE. Sen. Lausche referred to reports of food shortages in Russia and China and opposed U. S. shipments of food to Communist countries on the grounds it would permit them to put more money in guns and ammunition and less into food. pp. 9363-4

12. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. The Appropriation Committee reported amendments this bill, H. R. 11289 (S. Rept. 1578). p. 9309
with

13. AIR POLLUTION. Received from HEW a report, "Motor Vehicles, Air Pollution, and Health." p. 9310

14. COMMUNICATIONS. The Commerce Committee reported with an amendment H. R. 11040, to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system (S. Rept. 1584). p. 9310

15. FARM LABOR. The name of Sen. Clark was added as an additional cosponsor of S. 3382, to establish a program to assist in the construction of adequate

tection offered is limited by law to the general cost of producing a given crop in an area.

The Office of Rural Areas Development is responsible for accelerating departmental activities that lead to an expansion of job opportunities in farming communities and the small towns serving them. RAD operates under the general direction of a 13-agency board, of which the Director of Agricultural Credit serves as Chairman. The Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, provides Federal loan, grant, and technical aid for industrial and other enterprises in certain rural redevelopment countries. USDA has been delegated responsibility for administering this program and the Office of Rural Areas Development coordinates departmental activities.

Farmers Home Administration provides loans and technical assistance for the operation, purchase and improvement of family farms. Applications from veterans with farm experience receive preference. Borrowers must agree to refinance their loans with other lenders as soon as they are able to do so. FHA has about 1,400 local offices serving all agricultural counties. Loans are provided from funds provided by Congress and, in the case of farmownership, labor housing, and water development and soil conservation loans, from funds advanced by private lenders on an insured basis. Forty-three State directors, each assisted by a five-member advisory committee, administer the FHA program in their respective areas.

Rural Electrification Administration makes loans for the extension of central station electric service to unserved rural people and for the purpose of furnishing and improving rural telephone service. Construction loans are self-liquidating in a period of not to exceed 35 years.

The Farm Credit Administration supervises a nationwide system of credit cooperatives as an independent agency. The Secretary of Agriculture names one of the 13 board members.

In the national defense program, USDA is responsible for production, processing, storage, and distribution of food through the wholesaler level; stockpiling of food for emergency use (except in shelters), biological and chemical warfare defense for crops and animals; radiological defense in rural areas; and rural fire control. A special assistant to the Secretary on Defense coordinates and directs defense work within Agriculture, and provides liaison with other Federal agencies and State and local governments.

FOREIGN AID TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there apparently has been widespread misinterpretation in the press as to what the modified Mansfield-Dirksen amendment to the foreign aid bill does. In order to clarify this, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the following broadcast by Ray Henle on "Three-Star Extra" last Friday, June 8, the day that the modified amendment passed the Senate.

Mr. Henle said:

Some of the news dispatches give an impression that the Senate has reversed itself to the point of complete retreat from its original position of voting a prohibition on foreign aid to Communist and Marxist countries.

What the Senate did was to modify its original position to permit shipments of food as provided by existing law, but with four important conditions: (1) the recipient country must not be participating in Communist world conquest programs; (2) must not be controlled by a country advocating such a program; (3) the food must be a direct help to the U.S. security; and (4) the President publicly must notify the Congress of his intention to send such food shipments.

The Senate then also voted the Hickenlooper amendment providing that no U.S. foreign aid of any kind may go to a country which since January 1, 1962, has not paid for U.S. property expropriated, and further that the administration under no circumstances may waive the requirement for such payment.

The date is important. It means that unless Brazil and Ceylon now pay up for recently expropriated properties, they can get no U.S. foreign aid.

Thus it will seem that the Senate action of this week was a most important development in restoring congressional controls over foreign aid. Certainly the Senate served notice on all nations contemplating expropriation of U.S. properties that they will be ineligible for aid unless they make just compensation. Without such warning, many nations no doubt eagerly would have followed the practice of Brazil and Ceylon.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. HENRY J. KNOTT

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I have always been especially pleased to see proper recognition given to outstanding achievements, and consequently I was particularly delighted to see that one of my State's most exemplary women, Mrs. Henry J. Knott, had received the President's Medal from the College of Notre Dame of Maryland, in Baltimore. Mrs. Knott is the second women in the history of the college to be awarded the President's Medal, and I can attest personally to the fact that she is eminently worthy of the honor.

Prior to the presentation, an article amout Mrs. Knott was printed in the Evening Sun of Baltimore, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE HONORING MRS. KNOTT

(By Jeanne B. Sargeant)

Marion Burk Knott will receive the President's Medal at commencement ceremonies, Sunday, at the College of Notre Dame of Maryland to be held on the North Charles Street campus.

Mrs. Knott, who is the mother of 13 children (12 living), is pleased at her selection, but she is also mindful of the fact that Sunday she expects to become a grandmother. And while this will be the 17th grandchild for her and her husband, Henry J. Knott, it is an event about which she never becomes blase.

SECOND TIME

This is only the second time in the history of the college that the President's Medal has been awarded. Mrs. Knott's citation, to accompany the medal, will read:

"The President, Faculty, and Board of Directors of the College of Notre Dame, praising the sacrificial qualities in the life of the Christian mother, and with particular distinction, Marion Burk Knott * * * exemplar of the church's desire that women shall protect, nurture, and conserve not only the physical but also the spiritual and intellectual life of the family. Because Mrs. Knott exemplifies in her life the essential Christian woman giving and preserving, the bearer of grief and bringer of joy, loving, and greatly loved, the College of Notre Dame of Maryland takes pleasure in presenting her with the President's Medal for outstanding Christian motherhood."

TWELVE LISTED

The Knotts have been married for 34 years. They have had nine daughters and four sons, six of whom are married. The young people chronologically from the eldest are: Mrs. Patricia Smyth, who is a 1951 graduate of Notre Dame College; Sister Henry Marie, S.S.N.D., who is studying at Notre Dame and is also a teaching Sister at St. Mary's, Govans; Mrs. Alice Voelkel; Mrs. Margaret Riehl, Mrs. Catherine Wies, Henry J. R., Rose Marie Knott, Mrs. Lindsay Harris, the newest bride; Francis X., James F., Martin G., and Mary Stuart. Ann Carlisle, the sixth Knott child, died at the age of 12.

Seven of the youngsters attended the Institute of Notre Dame. Mrs. Riehl is a graduate of Mercy Hospital School of Nursing. Henry graduated from Loyola High School and night school. Mary and Martin are attending the Cathedral School, and Francis and Jimmy are at Regiopolis College in Kingston, Ontario, an English Jesuit school.

MANY HARBORED

The Knott brood has been raised on Greenway and for the past decade has lived in Lakehurst.

In addition to an even dozen children, the Heathfield road ranch property has harbored 35 sheep, a huge St. Bernard dog, geese, ducks, and a somewhat decrepit Irish terrier.

And then there were the two years when the Knotts took in Constance Noel Rann, who is now 9, after her mother died. Constance stayed with the Knotts for 2 years, 1953–55, until her father remarried and they made a new home in Ohio.

In a family of this size, life is never dull. This year there were three weddings in 11 months, and by September, grandchildren No. 17, 18, and 19 will have appeared on the scene.

NOT PERMISSIVE

Yet Mrs. Knott, a soft-spoken Richmond native, does not believe in permissiveness either with her children or her grandchildren.

"You do children no favor without discipline," she firmly believes. "I have always been very strict, and so is Mr. Knott."

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD WATERHOUSE RICE OF HAWAII

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, last week Tuesday, June 5, one of Hawaii's most illustrious and distinguished native sons passed from the island scene. He was Harold Waterhouse Rice of the Valley Isle, Maui, a descendant of two prominent pioneering families in Hawaii.

His life spanned more than three-fourths of a century, with 55 of his 79 years on his beloved Maui where he was affiliated with Hawaiian Commercial & Sugar Co. and where he carried on his extensive cattle ranching business.

Harold Waterhouse Rice was an outstanding member of the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii for 24 years, serving one session as its president. During a part of this time, I served in the house of representatives. I remember him as a hard working, progressive, capable, and a most discerning senator.

I also served with him as a delegate to the Hawaii State Constitutional Convention. He contributed much to its deliberations. He also served his people well as executive officer and member of

the Board of Supervisors of the Island of Maui.

From his grandfather, Rev. Harrison Rice, he inherited a great love and concern for his fellow man, and these attributes remained with him throughout his long life. From his maternal grandfather, John T. Waterhouse, he inherited the business acumen which made him a successful businessman.

In his lifetime, Harold Rice was privileged to witness the full spectrum of Hawaii's political life—Monarchy, Republic, Territory, and finally statehood in this great American Union.

He firmly believed in a strong two-party system of Government. So convinced was he of the need for a strong minority that in 1943 he resigned from the Republican Party after more than 25 years as an active member to join the Democratic Party which was then the minority party.

In business, he was also as nonconforming as he was in politics. He disagreed with management in many of its policies and led many stockholders' fights against what he felt was not to the benefit of the stockholders.

Controversial as Harold Rice was in politics and in business, he was beloved by his people.

He was colorful, knowledgeable, and dynamic, and with his passing, a portion of Hawaii has passed on forever.

Mr. President, the entire State of Hawaii mourns the passing of its beloved Keiki Hanau o Ka Aina—son of the land—Harold Waterhouse Rice—acclaimed by Valley Islanders as the man who has done the most for Maui.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR HENRY FOUNTAIN ASHURST

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the concluding words in the diary that Henry Fountain Ashurst kept throughout his life are these:

> It is a comforting assurance that nothing in this diary will cause pain to any person or bring reproach to anyone who is dead.

Henry Ashurst was elected one of the first two Senators from the new State of Arizona in 1912, and he continued to serve the State and the Nation in that capacity for 30 years. His many contributions to both I will not enumerate here as they are well established in the memory of time. Henry Ashurst's greatest fame probably stemmed from his devotion to the perfection of the use of the English language. His was a voice tutored not by the pulse of the ballot, but by the beat of logic. He was a man not driven to victory over his brother by force or innuendo, or depredation, but, by the logic of argument.

Emerson, in his essay, "Nature," remarks that a "third use which nature serves to man is that of language," and in the section of this essay touching on language, he points out again and again the closeness of nature to the words of man. This is true, for we find honesty of expression coming from people whose lives have been in contact with nature. His years in tht saddle as a cowboy carried Henry Ashurst into the remote places of Arizona where he found in nature a true source of expression, likewise a source of inspiration. As young Henry clopped, clopped his way across the desert sands or the pine needled cushions of the forest floor, or across the sandstone floors of the canyons, he recalled that he had directed thousands of speeches to the brush of the desert, to the blueness of the juniper tree, to the red walls of the canyons, and surely his words must have carried high into the sighing pines and across the waters of the lakes of his county of Coconino. Words that no one but his horse and himself heard; words which are now floating around in space, mingling with words of other men who have become beacons of expression, who likewise, inspired by nature's closeness and by the loneliness of the saddle, orated or sang or spoke verse to an inanimate world of beauty. Such men all attest to the wisdom of the words of Emerson, who wrote, "that picturesque language is at once a commending certificate that he who employs it is a man in alliance with truth and with God."

While the language we all speak and write became the center around which Senator Ashurst's life revolved, it was far from the only remembrance those of us who loved him carry. His life was a dedicated one in which hard work was the keystone. In fact, the thought of his accomplishments reminds me of the stories my uncle, who served in politics with Senator Ashurst, used to tell me about the boat trips up the Colorado River. Large iron rings would be set in the stone faces of the canyon wall or secured to the trunks of great trees along the shores. Through these rings the Captain would pass ropes and then by a series of heave ho's from those on board, including passengers and crew alike, the boat would pass over the sandy shoals and into the deeper and more navigable waters.

As Henry Ashurst encountered shoals on his journey up the changeable river of life, he would not sit waiting for the fates to release him, but he would look hard for some strong point to which to fasten his rope, and then pull himself through to better water. His was an exemplary life for that reason, among many others, for he was a living example of the benefits that come to men who live with freedom and independence of thought.

Ashurst's life spread as the two tips of a draftsman's compass from the day of the old to the day of the new, and he carried across that long span of time qualities of gentlemanliness and decency, scholarship and application, devotion and patriotism which will serve forever as an example to generations to come. As history unfolds, the greatness of this man will likewise come to life, and the words closing his diary, "is a comforting assurance that nothing in this diary will cause pain to any living person or bring reproach to the memory of anyone who is dead," will prove to be true. Not only that, but they will prove to those of us who follow that logic can prevail where violence fails.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

THE MORALITY OF NUCLEAR TESTING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suppose that in recent months most Senators have had the same mail experience I have had in regard to one of the hottest controversial issues that have been of great interest to the American people. I refer to the issue of the resumption of atmospheric nuclear testing by the United States.

I am satisfied that the President of the United States studied, pondered, and wrestled with this problem far beyond, even, our power to comprehend what the man endured; for we who served with the President when he was a Senator from Massachusetts, and served with him, as I did, on the Committee on Foreign Relations, know full well the long-time, deep concern of the present President of the United States in regard to both the great danger which nuclear testing in the atmosphere presents not only to the American people but to all mankind, and also his recognition of the very serious problems of morality which are involved in the issue of nuclear testing. I cannot speak for the President, but it is perfectly easy to deduce from the Record the strain he must have endured before reaching his final determination to resume nuclear testing. I share the point of view the President reached. I do not believe he could have reached any other decision in the interest of the security of the Nation and in the interest of advancing the cause of freedom throughout the world.

In a previous speech, I discussed the problem as being one of a choice between immoralities—as a choice between degrees. However, I do not think that any of us who believes in a Divine Being—which is true of almost all Americans—can escape the conclusion that nuclear testing is immoral. In fact, I do not believe we can escape the fact that the building of nuclear armaments and the participation in a nuclear armament race are immoral. However, there are greater immoralities inseparably connected with the issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS OF PAN AM: JUAN TRIPPE: BIRTHDAY OF AN EMPIRE

Thirty-five years ago last Friday a 27-year-old bond salesman turned dabbler in commercial aviation formed a new company to fly the 90-mile Key West-to-Havana route.

From such a beginning Juan Terry Trippe and his infant Pan American Airways blazed a world-wide pattern of air travel stretching nearly as far as three times around the earth.

As Pan American World Airways, the company now flies about 165,000 route miles, a distance unequalled by any other private-enterprise carrier although exceeded by government-owned or subsidized foreign lines.

Its 130 planes, about half of them $6 to $7 million jets, touch down in 80 countries.

A subsidiary has built or is building a global chain of 26 hotels on 6 continents, partly to accommodate patrons who last year traveled over 6 billion revenue miles.

ANOTHER SIDELINE

In another "sideline" activity, Pan Am since 1953 has run the Atlantic missile range for the Air Force out of Cape Canaveral—an operation requiring 9,000 employees ranging from frogmen to mechanics and sailors on a fleet of 10 seagoing ships.

Six hundred more of its 32,000 employees are assigned, under an Army Signal Corps contract, to the electronic environmental test facility and drone test range in Arizona.

From $200,000 in capital raised by Cornelius V. Whitney, a classmate at Yale University, Pan Am's assets have risen to about $600 million.

Characteristically, Mr. Trippe, a retiring and somewhat aloof man for all his dynamism, paid no formal heed to today's milestone.

His office in Manhattan which soon will occupy a new 69-story Pan Am Building erected astride Grand Central terminal, reported he was away on the system—in Bermuda.

ONLY A NAME TO SOME

Some longtime employees of supervisory rank have never met the big boss, or have seen him only two or three times.

Although Mr. Trippe's vision of aviation's future probably dates from boyhood when he flew model planes in New York's Central Park, his first adult enterprises in the field were disappointing.

A Navy flier in World War I, he got his feet wet in the early 1920's by organizing Long Island airways, using war-vintage planes bought with borrowed money.

Passengers were taken up on sightseeing flights, and the company offered a charter service and did contract work for motion picture concerns.

Then, Mr. Trippe turned to another enterprise, Colonial Air Transport, flying between New York and Boston. Colonial received the country's first domestic airmail contract.

PAN AM BORN OF A ROW

He left Colonial and launched Pan Am after financial backers quarreled with his plans to extend the company's operations to Chicago and to Miami and Havana.

By 1928, the Key West-Havana operation, started in October 1927, with a trimotored Fokker craft, had expanded to 7 planes, supported by 118 employees, over 251 miles of routes.

These reached mostly south into the Caribbean area.

In 7 more years, Pan Am had inaugurated its China Clipper service, and a few years later thrust its routes across the Atlantic to Europe, and a little later to Africa.

The airline had begun to roll up "firsts" in commercial aviation, many of them results of the laboratory for over-ocean flying provided by Caribbean island-hopping operations.

TALENTS GREW, TOO

Pan Am thus claims to have pioneered among airlines in radio communications, emergency lifesaving equipment, tailoring of aircraft operational needs, instrument flying, and serving meals aloft.

Talents in diplomacy aided Mr. Trippe in complex negotiations over routes and ground rights in innumerable countries as Pan Am fanned out, and he proved adroit in complementary arrangements necessary in Washington.

Mr. Trippe early committed his company to an attempt to apply to commerical air transport the American genius that expressed itself in industry as the technique of mass production.

In a 1943 speech, he said the choice was one of "becoming a luxury service to carry the well to do at high prices, or to carry the average man at what he could afford to pay."

He also saw even broader implications for mass air travel, saying in 1955 it "may prove to be more significant to world destiny than the atom bomb."

On that occasion, he went on:

"For there can be no atom bomb potentially more powerful than the air tourist, charged with curiosity, enthusiasm and good will, who can roam the four corners of the world, meeting in friendship and understanding the people of other nations and races."

HONORS GALORE

One of the most decorated of American civilians, Mr. Trippe has been honored with medals and orders of 17 countries.

In 1947, former President Harry S. Truman presented him with the Harmon aviation trophy in recognition of World War II services, including Pan Am's ferry of critical materials, personnel and combat planes to farflung battlefronts.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, House bill 10802, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, has been made the unfinished business of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that no points of order against legislation in an appropriation bill be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 2, line 9, after the word "Management", to strike out "$39,375,000" and insert "$41,022,200."

On page 5, line 14, after the word "museums", to strike out "$81,000,000" and insert "$82,827,000".

On page 5, line 23, after the word "law", to strike out "$34,300,000" and insert "$34,677,000".

On page 6, line 10, after the word "contract", to strike out "$52,000,000" and insert "$55,550,000".

On page 7, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$17,000,000".

On page 7, line 6, after the word "offices", to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,350,000".

On page 7, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "twenty" and insert "thirty", and in the same line, after the word "including", to strike out "fifty" and insert "seventy-one".

On page 9, line 1, after the word "funds", to insert "other than judgment funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission or the Court of Claims".

On page 9, line 23, after the word "Basin", to strike out "$25,425,000" and insert "$26,034,320".

On page 10, at the beginning of line 19, to strike out "$8,409,000" and insert "$11,635,000"; in line 20, after the word "property", to strike out "$40,000,000" and insert "$44,526,000", and in the same line, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the condemnation of any land for Grand Teton National Park in the State of Wyoming."

On page 11, line 17, after the word "offices", to strike out "$1,900,000" and insert "$1,964,000".

On page 11, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "thirty-five" and insert "fifty-two", and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "fifty" and insert "fifty-seven".

On page 16, line 8, after "(72 Stat. 837)", to insert "conduct investigations of marine geology and hydrology;", and in line 17, after the word "activities", to strike out "$56,100,000" and insert "$56,900,000".

On page 18, line 8, after the word "substitutes", to strike out "$26,550,000" and insert "$26,887,000".

On page 19, line 22, after the word "limitation", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000".

On page 20, line 6, after "(74 Stat. 337)", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$3,450,000".

On page 20, line 16, after the word "amended", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$875,000".

On page 22, line 1, after the word "law", to strike out "$14,600,000" and insert "$15,981,500".

On page 22, at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "$7,900,000" and insert "$8,473,000".

On page 23, line 24, after the word "deer", to strike out "$26,500,000" and insert "$27,436,000".

On page 24, line 6, after the word "therein", to insert "(including improvements of the county road from Brigham City, Utah, to the headquarters Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge)", and in line 8, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$4,900,000" and insert "$8,033,800".

On page 24, line 17, after the word "offices", to strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$1,331,000".

On page 24, line 21, after the word "and", to strike out "seventeen" and insert "twenty-four".

On page 26, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$7,600,000" and insert "$7,700,000", and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$525,000" and insert "$625,000".

On page 26, line 9, after "(42 U.S.C. 1958a–1958g)", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,085,000," and in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$175,000" and insert "$225,000".

On page 26, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "$3,600,000" and insert "$3,747,000".

On page 27, line 3, after the word "only", to strike out "$3,350,000" and insert "$3,340,000".

On page 29, line 21, after the word "lands", to strike out "$138,400,000" and insert "$141,045,000", and on page 30, line 1, after the word "than", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$805,000".

On page 30, line 10, after the word "law", to strike out "$22,975,000" and insert "$25,865,000".

On page 30, line 18, to strike out "$15,800,000" and insert "$16,405,000".

On page 31, after line 7, to insert:

"ACCESS ROADS

"For acquiring by condemnation or otherwise additional roads needed for access to national forest lands in carrying out the Act of June 4, 1897, as amended (16 U.S.C. 471, 472, 475, 476, 551), $2,000,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 32, after line 7, to insert:

"For acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), as amended, authorizing annual appropriation of forest receipts for such purposes, from such receipts, $20,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of the national forest."

On page 33, line 4, after "(16 U.S.C. 568e)", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,500,000".

On page 33, line 9, after the word "and", to strike out "fifty-two" and insert "seventy-nine."

On page 35, line 5, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$70,000" and insert "$80,000".

On page 35, line 19, after the word "Act", to strike out "$55,284,000" and insert "$57,000,000".

On page 36, line 4, after "(42 U.S.C. 2004a)", to strike out "$8,320,000" and insert "$9,335,000".

On page 38, line 13, after "(5 U.S.C. 2131)", to strike out "$3,350,000" and insert "$2,825,000".

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee, as indicated on page 1 of the report, considered budget estimates of $932,674,000, including indefinite appropriations of receipts and requested borrowing authorizations, for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior and for the related agencies listed on page 2 of the report. Excluded from this bill are the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The committee recommends definite appropriations totaling $885,037,820 for the programs and activities of these agencies, an increase of $33,945,820 over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives, and a decrease of $16,133,180 under the sum of the budget estimates.

The major increases recommended by the committee are as follows:

Bureau of Indian Affairs	$1,023,000
Office of Coal Research	1,450,000
Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	811,500
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	4,811,800
Forest Service	4,145,000
Division of Indian Health	1,281,000

The committee feels that these increases, as well as decreases under the budget estimates for certain of the bureaus, are necessary and adequate to accomplishment of national resources and research programs.

FORESTRY RESEARCH APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on the committee's recommendation for an increase for forestry research in the appropriations for the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. The committee recommendation is for $25,865,000 which is $2,715,000 more than the budget estimate for forestry research.

The proposed increase to which I refer is for strengthening several highly important research projects and for constructing high priority research laboratories.

Last February 15, I spoke before the Senate about a national forestry research program and what it needed to move us ahead in the development of our forest resources. My proposals at that time went somewhat beyond the increases in forestry research which the Appropriation Committee recommends. However, the committee increases represent a step forward and should be approved. They show real foresight by the committee in providing for forestry research that is badly needed.

I want to call special attention to the committee's proposal to provide for eight laboratory construction projects. Unfortunately, the fiscal year 1963 budget for Forest Service research construction was reduced by $4,445,000 under the 1962 allowance. This is a backward step but I am glad to see that the committee has provided for eight laboratory projects which will, in part, restore the funds needed for the construction program.

The committee proposal provides for $150,000 for a watershed and silviculture laboratory at Parsons, W. Va. This will equip the existing program with badly needed facilities and will speed important work in protecting soil and watershed values.

Another project of $450,000 for watershed, range, and wildlife habitat research at Tempe, Ariz., is of exceptional importance in solving problems of that area. Although only half of the amount needed, it will provide for a good start on the facilities ultimately required.

At Alexandria, La., $450,000 is proposed for a southern pine utilization laboratory and companion facilities for the silviculture, range, and fire and insect protection research. This also is but half of the eventual estimated needs but it, too, represents a step ahead.

The committee proposes $250,000 for a forest recreation and wildlife habitat laboratory at Warren, Pa. This will provide for the initial stage of a badly needed facility at that location.

At Sewanee, Tenn., research workers have been crowded into inadequate quarters with limited equipment to push ahead their research. A proposal of $200,000 will provide better laboratory facilities for important research in timber production and improved cultural methods.

Improvement of the management of western mountain watersheds will be speeded by approval of $450,000 proposed for a laboratory at Logan, Utah. This is but half of the current needs for watershed research but it will represent a start in equipping scientists working in this important area.

At Redding, Calif., it is proposed that $250,000 be made available for a timber management, utilization, and insect research laboratory. Here, too, important research will greatly benefit from the facilities that can be provided with this sum even though it is only a little more than half of the $450,000 needed for a complete project.

Finally, I call your special attention to a proposal to provide $380,000 for preliminary planning and engineering necessary for the expansion of the Forest Service's Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. This needed wood chemistry and pulp and paper laboratory is long overdue, and I am pleased indeed that the committee's proposal for necessary planning can proceed, paving the way for an appropriation for actual construction at an early date.

Let me call the special attention of the Senate to two projects which illustrate the importance of forestry research and benefits which result from such research.

Recently, I participated in the dedication of the Hardwood Research Laboratory at Stoneville, Miss., where I saw many remarkable accomplishments. The research scientists at this laboratory have already produced a fast growing cottonwood tree which increased 15 feet in height and 2 inches in diameter in the first year. New techniques in the planting and production of cottonwoods are now being widely used by landowners in the area. This is typical of the excellent research being done at Stoneville and other research laboratories, and I am pleased that the committee has recommended a small increase in funds to speed up this and other essential work now in progress.

Another project given special attention by the committee is research on restoration of strip-mined land in the

Appalachian region. In the production of coal, strip mining is a very important activity but unfortunately it frequently does great damage to the soil, water, timber, and other forest resources.

The committee has recommended an increase of $200,000 for this vital research and this increase will provide for a balanced study of the problem and lead to the development of ways to carry on strip mining with a minimum damage to the land. Further, we are confident that this research will lead to the determination of steps which can be taken to restore these damaged lands to their full productivity.

The only way to meet the forest product needs of our Nation in the decades ahead is by long-range programs, planned and put into effect well in advance of the end product need. Our Nation will have a population of over 400 million people 40 years from now. This is more than twice our present population, and we must prepare now in order to have the necessary resources then.

I commend the chairman and members of the subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee for their wisdom and foresight in recommending a sound forestry research program. Much is left to be done in future years but we are making steady progress in the right direction.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to support the appropriation bill for the Forest Service as reported by the Appropriation Committee and compliment that committee for recognizing the need for increased attention to our forest resources.

I was particularly pleased to see the increases provided for forest research. This important activity provides the sound basis of knowledge needed to guide programs aimed at protecting, managing and utilizing the timber, water, forage, wildlife, and recreation resources of our forest lands. In these days of concern over the atom and travel to outer space it is gratifying to see this recognition of the importance of our basic natural resources.

I would like to speak specifically with respect to two items proposed by the committee included in the increase for Forest Research. The first is $200,000 for "expanded research on restoration of strip-mined land in the Appalachian region" and the second is $250,000 for "initiation of construction of a Forest Recreation and Wildlife Habitat Laboratory at Warren, Pa."

Strip-mining for coal is an important activity throughout a large part of the Appalachian region. This method of coal extraction is relatively inexpensive and supplies a significant portion of this country's energy requirements. At the same time strip-mining has in the past and is at present doing too much damage to our water, timber, and other forest resources. The increase proposed will provide a well-balanced research effort on the problem of how to carry on strip-mining with a minimum of damage to the other resources during the mining operation and insure complete restoration of strip-mined lands to their full productive and functional capacity. This research is of great importance to my State and many others in the East and I strongly support it.

The forest lands of my State as well as the surrounding States are located within a relatively few miles of the largest metropolitan areas of the country. The demand for forest recreation, including hunting and fishing, has reached tremendous proportions and is continuing to grow. Research is urgently needed to determine how the needs might best be met, how to manage heavy recreation use so that the other resources are not destroyed and the recreation environment is itself not irreparably damaged. The proposed laboratory at Warren, Pa., will provide a much-needed facility to expedite the research on forest recreation and wildlife habitat. Although the full laboratory and equipment will require $450,000, the $250,000 proposed by the committee for fiscal year 1963 will provide a first stage on this much-needed facility.

I strongly urge that the Senate approve the Forest Service appropriation item as reported by the Appropriation Committee.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a telegram from the Outdoor Writers Association of America dealing with the item in the pending Interior Department appropriations bill for additional construction at the National Marine Research Laboratory at Sandy Hook, N.J. I hope that the Senate will concur in the recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee for a start on such construction.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *May 31, 1962.*

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As directors of the Outdoor Writers Association of America, with membership of 1,500 in the United States, we urge you to support the $150,000 construction item for National Marine Research included in the Interior Department appropriations bill (H.R. 10802) and referred to in Senate Report 1490, page 16.

These funds would permit the construction of essential laboratory facilities for biological and ecological studies into the grave fish depletion problem which exists off all our coastal areas. Such research, first authorized by the Congress in 1959, is of great importance to the more than 6 million saltwater fishermen throughout the country, and to all States that derive considerable revenue from this sport in the form of tourist expenditures and equipment sales.

At present, the Interior Department has a laboratory at Sandy Hook, N.J., another on the west coast, and plans to open a third along the Gulf of Mexico. The modest sum recommended in the Senate report for the entire marine research program falls far short of the maximum annual authorization of $2.7 million provided in the original legislation, but it will at least enable this vital program to get underway at last.

RICHARD C. WOLFF GRITS.
GRESHAM BILL BROWNING.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 10, it is proposed to strike the figure "$41,022,200" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$41,152,000."

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the amendment would restore to the bill the amount of $129,800.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has again demonstrated his outstanding leadership in the field of conservation. He and his committee are to be congratulated for bringing in a well-balanced and forward-looking bill covering the many conservation activities of the Federal Government.

I am deeply disturbed, however, as I know a great many others are, by the drastic cutback which the committee's report calls for in the conservation information and education activities of the Bureau of Land Management. Any monetary savings from such a reduction can only be made at the expense of information very much needed by the Congress and by the public.

The Bureau of Land Management is responsible for more than 475 million acres of public lands that are the property of all the people. For many, many years the land managed by the Bureau has suffered from neglect and over-use. Members of Congress were inadequately informed about what was happening to these lands and what was needed.

The Bureau of Land Management is one of the great resource agencies of the Government, Mr. President. It returns to the U.S. Treasury more than $7 for every $1 appropriated by the Congress. The activities of the Bureau are a wise investment in our Nation's future and in the future of these very valuable natural resources that belong to all the people. The work of the Bureau is of vital interest to members of Congress and to the public. But there are very few people who know anything at all about this great natural resources heritage which they own and in which they have such a vital interest.

The reduction would abolish 16 out of the Bureau's 21 programed information and education positions, including each of the 11 men handling this type of work in the Bureau's 11 Western State offices. One is in Salt Lake City and others are in Anchorage, Portland, Sacramento, Boise, Reno, Phoenix, Billings, Cheyenne, Denver, and Santa Fe. The reduction would also cut back the headquarters staff to 5, leaving a staff obviously too weak to alequately inform the Congress or the public about what the Bureau is doing and why. Mr. President, no other major natural resources agency has such a small conservation information and education staff, while the BLM manages more land, and takes in more revenues than any other conservation agency.

Mr. President, each year some half a million citizens visit and another half million write letters to the Government land offices seeking information about how to obtain public lands. In the past a lack of adequate information has left the people confused and befuddled—making them easy prey for certain un-

ethical land promoters and speculators. I know many of my colleagues in the Senate have received woeful complaints from citizens in their State who have either lost money or failed to obtain information they sought. An adequate program to inform the public about the public lands can save the taxpayers many thousands of dollars and Senators many hours spent straightening out situations that arose chiefly from the lack of adequate knowledge about the rights and privileges of citizens under the Nation's public land laws.

Information and education work in Government agencies has often been the object of economy cuts. Sometimes these programs have grown out-of-bounds. However, this agency is at the other end of the scale. Even the 21 positions they had planned for is a bare-bones staff. The public and the Congress have a right to know what the Government agencies are doing. The failure of the public to know can only lead to clothing Government operations in darkness and ignorance. Adequate public information is one guarantee under our system of Government that the public interest is being fully protected. We must not jeopardize that interest by the false economy of such drastic cuts in this important work.

I therefore move, Mr. President, that the 16 positions for this needed work be restored and that the Senate amend the bill to include the $129,800 needed to finance this vital effort.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to associate myself with the amendment. It is highly desirable. The reduction that was made is very unwise and unfortunate. I hope the Senate will see fit to restore the small appropriation which will take care of these few positions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, first I should like to have the amendment read. I have no idea what is involved. The amendment is not before us in printed form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 2, line 10, to strike out "$41,022,200" and insert in lieu thereof "$41,152,000."

Mr. MUNDT. Before discussing the amendment, I should like to say a few words about the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who for more than 50 years has contributed his efforts and talents to his country. He has always adhered to the principles of government laid down by our Founding Fathers. It is difficult to comprehend how many hundreds of appropriation bills have been brought to and passed by the Senate during the time that our chairman has served in this body.

In the comparatively few years that I have been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, as contrasted with the half century served by the chairman, I have had many opportunities to watch him in action; and as ranking minority member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, which now has a bill before the Senate, I have had an opportunity to work with him intimately and closely in trying to adjudicate the differences which are always encountered in connection with an appropriation bill of this type.

I commend the Senator from Arizona for the attitude which he has consistently displayed, not only in his service as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but also as chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations. I have come to know CARL HAYDEN exceedingly well.

No matter how drawn out or long a hearing might be, he would not close it until everyone interested had an opportunity to be heard. He never allows prejudice to influence the conduct of a hearing; and he conducts the proceedings of his committee without partisanship.

Our subcommittee has provided the establishment of criteria which require a proposal to meet rather stern and rigorous tests; namely, adequacy for the agency involved, meeting the needs of the country, and insuring that the taxpayers' money is protected, and not wasted.

We should keep those qualifications and characteristics in mind as we approach a discussion of the bill on the floor of the Senate. Undoubtedly a number of efforts will be made to upset the fruits of the long, tedious tasks involved in the hearings of the subcommittee and of the full committee. Undoubtedly efforts will be made, such as the one before the Senate now, to increase an appropriation, and perhaps efforts will be made to reduce appropriations in certain respects. We have gone through these items with a fine-toothed comb. We have carefully considered them. The bill before us has passed the tests which I mentioned earlier.

The amount in the bill is above the House recommendation, but I invite attention to the fact that it is about $16 million under the budget estimates, yet sufficient to take care of the most urgent activities and programs which measure up to the tests relative to our national needs, activities which reach into every State of the Union. If we had yielded to every request for additional funds, the bill would have been many times above the budget request, instead of $16 million under it.

We could have made an indiscriminate across-the-board reduction which would have done serious injury to some of our national projects. Of some $40 million which the bill provides above and beyond the amount provided by the House, about one-fourth involves the education of Indian children, and one-fourth is devoted to trying to bring the white man's opportunity to the descendants of the red man, from whom, after all, our great land was taken in the only act of aggression in which this country has ever become involved. I hope that if at any time attempts are made to reduce the appropriation, they will be made in such a way as to exempt the effort to bring some element of justice to the American Indian living in our midst. Anyone who is familiar with the record of our treatment of the American Indian must recognize that it is not a bright spot on the escutcheon of American history. We have failed our Indian friends miserably down through the years. This failure has been manifest whether the administrations have been Republican or Democratic. In some way or other, we have failed to provide the educational opportunities for Indian youth which were offered as a matter of national policy to every other youngster in this country. In one way or another, we have failed to provide the employment opportunities for Indian youth which are offered to other youth. The American Indian has not organized himself into a political bloc. He does not have an organization constantly pleading for his rights or his opportunities. I appeal to the conscience of the Senate and of America, because we are doing little enough in providing a few extra million dollars to assist Indian youngsters with a decent and practical education.

As I commend the chairman for his fairminded and helpful leadership of the committee, I also hope the Senate will follow his recommendations, because they come to the Senate with the unanimous approval of the Committee on Appropriations. The recommendations were unanimous so far as the subcommittee was concerned; and, as I recall, they were unanimous in the full committee. I hope and expect that the chairman will continue to defend the committee's position; that he will not yield, on behalf of the committee, to requests for increases, because if we are to labor hard, carefully, and well on appropriation bills, as we have done, it seems to me we should defend them. I hope we can defend them successfully on the floor of the Senate. If once we begin to rewrite a bill on the floor of the Senate, we will open Pandora's box, and nobody can determine the ultimate financial consequences of such a course.

Therefore, I must oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], as I shall have to oppose other amendments if they are offered, because it seems to me that all the arguments and reasons offered by him were considered both by the subcommittee and the full committee. In the areas where we can economize, and where we did economize, it seems to me we should not, on the spur of the moment, by senatorial action, without the support of the hearings required, decide immediately, on the first paragraph of the first page of the bill, to increase the burden of the taxpayer and put the Government further into the red.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his kind references to me. It was a pleasure to work with him during the long hours we worked on the bill. I join with him in the hope that the Senate may approve our work.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I, too, wish to join the Senator from South

Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Department of the Interior Appropriations, in commending the chairman of the subcommittee for his fairness in dealing with the many controversial issues which arose during the consideration and marking up of this appropriation bill. It is inevitable and only natural that the minority party, which happens now to be Republican, is represented by four members on the subcommittee, while the majority party has nine members. Obviously, the minority could have been outvoted at any time. So it is reassuring to know that the distinguished Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the subcommittee, has acted in a spirit of fair play, primarily because he understands the basic issues underlying the utilization and preservation of the Nation's valuable assets in the public lands States of the West.

Mr. President, I oppose the amendment which has been offered by the junior Senator from Utah. It is not difficult for me to understand that probably the amendment may be agreed to. However, I feel certain that if Senators have read some of the hearings and the report on the bill, and if they have paid any attention, as I am sure they have, to the general budget for the next fiscal year, they will know that while there are assurances that there will be a balanced budget or an actual surplus in the next fiscal year, already there is an admission that there will likely be a $7 billion or an $8 billion deficit—and the deficit probably will be higher than that.

The budget submitted for the next fiscal year provides for the employment of approximately 46,000 more employees in the executive departments of the Government. For the Department of the Interior, which the Senate is discussing today, the Bureau of the Budget requested funds to provide for 5,395 additional employees. I know that we are getting America on the move; we are going places; we are using more red ink than we have ever used. If the President of the United States is sincere—and I think he is—in appealing to the American people today to aid him in his efforts to stabilize our economy and to meet some of the serious challenges which confront us both at home and abroad, it seems to me that while it is very important that we resist successfully Communist infiltration and aggression in every corner of the globe, nevertheless we must, at the same time, recognize—and I feel certain that every Member of the Senate, regardless of the party of which he is a member, knows it—that we cannot maintain the kind of leadership which is essential for the free nations of the world unless we maintain a strong financial structure at home.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senate should know that the subcommittee did not deal in a parsimonious fashion with the Department of the Interior in connection with the Bureau of Land Management, because by committee action we increased by almost $2 million the funds allotted by the House for this purpose.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from Utah will not press his amendment. If he does, I shall do my best to obtain a yea-and-nay vote, because I think we might as well put the Senate on record, in connection with the very first page of the bill, as to whether we desire to ignore the careful attention paid to the bill by the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and finally by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate. I do not believe we should indiscriminately increase the appropriation for an item of this kind. I think we have done well to increase the appropriation by an amount which we will seek to protect and defend when we reach the conference. However, if the Senator from Utah insists on trying to provide extra money at this time, I believe there should be a yea-and-nay vote, and I hope the Senator from Idaho will help me to get it.

I think the amendment should then be defeated.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

An erroneous statement has been made that the subcommittee has abolished 15 or 16 public information positions, providing for the employment of additional personnel in the central office here and 1 public information officer in each of about 12 district offices in the field, one of which would be established in the district office at Boise, Idaho.

The record will show that for several years there have been five information officers and personnel in the central office of the Bureau of Land Management. The proposal now before the Senate is a proposal made by the Bureau of the Budget for adding 16 more public information officers. I am sure that the realistic Senators from the Western States know that it is not necessary to have 16 more information officers.

There is no intent or desire on my part, and I am sure there is none on the part of the subcommittee, to suppress legitimate publicity or information, which has been available for several years. But there has been some extremely critical, unreasonable, and unfair publicity to the effect that those of us who have tried to eliminate the 16 new positions—not to eliminate existing jobs, because they have not yet been created; it is merely proposed that they now be established for the first time—are trying to suppress information relating to the operation of the district offices and the central office of the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. President, many Members of the Senate who formerly had newspaper experience know, I am sure, that it is not necessary to have 21 information officers to handle publicity emanating from the Bureau of Land Management here in Washington and in the various district offices.

I would be somewhat hesitant to charge that an attempt is being made to set up an elaborate propaganda bureau, because I do not think that was the intent of those who made this proposal. But it might very easily be assumed that that is the purpose of this amendment, so that instead of having 5 employees in the Office of Information, Bureau of Land Management, there would be 21.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. This morning I talked with officials of the Bureau of Land Management. These positions are now in existence. So in the event this amount of money is eliminated, as is now proposed, a certain number of personnel will be eliminated.

By calling for the restoration of the $129,800, we are merely trying to continue the positions now in existence.

The positions proposed to be eliminated would be eliminated in the State offices in the 11 Western States, plus the elimination of 7 personnel in the Washington, D.C., office. So those are the ones we are talking about.

A very adequate discussion of this question is to be found in an editorial published on June 7 in the Salt Lake Tribune—a newspaper which has been very consistent in its editorial policy about economy in government and about insisting upon justification for every Federal position. But, as is pointed out in the editorial, an effort is being made to starve the agency which manages so much of our domain, including 74 percent of my own State. An effort is being made to starve it, by cutting out the information service which is needed. These personnel are not publicity personnel, as such, who get out press releases. Instead, they handle inquiries from citizens who seek information about public lands and about how to proceed if they wish to make a filing or do anything else in connection with public land. That is why this item is of such great importance to all the Western States.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Budget request for the $129,800 to be used to pay these 16 new positions indicates that these are new positions, currently being created. If they were set up in the past and if they have actually been in operation, I should like to know where the money with which to pay them was obtained and why it is necessary now to ask for an increased budget in order to pay personnel who are said to be already on the payroll.

Mr. President, it may be futile to argue infavor of economy. This idea involves only the amount of $129,800; but the point is that if this precedent were established in regard to the Bureau of Land Management, there could be justification for adding, not only 16, but many hundreds of public information officers; and every Senator knows that in an election year, sometimes such information officers do work other than that related to the particular bureau or agency in which they are employed.

So I support the position taken by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and its ranking Republican member, because I think the record clearly indicates that if we can go overboard now in extending information services which are indirectly related to propaganda, probably we shall be faced with requests to add additional personnel, because a precedent will have been established.

For that reason, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in opposing the amendment.

In answer to the argument that the extra 16 employees are needed, I call attention to the fact that in the first 16 months of this administration the Department of the Interior alone has added 5,694 new employees. Based upon the report submitted by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Government Expenditures on December 31, 1960, the Department of the Interior had a total of 50,519 employees; and by the end of April 1962—the most recent date for which such figures are available—the Department had increased that number to 56,213—or an additional number, in the first 16 months of this administration, of 5,694 new employees. Breaking down that number by months, it amounts to approximately 356 a month, or 89 a week; and on the basis of a 5-day workweek, that means that for the past 16 months the Department of the Interior has been adding approximately 18 new employees every day during the first 16 months of this administration.

There must come a time when instead of adding new employees we should decrease the number. Certainly we do not now need any more employees.

So I join my colleagues not only in the effort to eliminate this particular increase but also in the effort to make additional cuts in this bill.

Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to add a word of commendation of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] for his great speech and for his pointing out exactly where we are going in failing to practice economy in the hiring of the hundreds of thousands of additional persons who have been placed on the Federal payroll.

I would not be so much concerned about the extra $120,800 proposed to be added to this appropriation, were it not for the fact that only last week this very body authorized the expenditure of $750 million additional for public works programs—$750 million which is not even included in the budget. I do not know how we are ever going to get a balanced budget—which the President of the United States has promised the American people—if we add $750 million, one week, and add another $120,800—and perhaps more—this week.

I should like to find out from some Senator on the other side of the aisle exactly where we are going to make up the difference for the $750 million which was authorized last week. It is fine to talk about a balanced budget, but such talk means nothing unless a balanced budget is delivered.

The Senator from Idaho has pointed out that sometimes it seems futile to talk about economy. However, I do not think it is ever futile to talk about real economy, for the American people and all Members of the Senate know it is right to have a balanced budget and to practice fiscal integrity with the people's money.

So I thank the Senator from Idaho for bringing this question to the attention of the Senate, and I join my colleagues in opposing this amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is not the Senator from Delaware a member of the committee that heard the testimony in regard to the item now before the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] are members of the Appropriations Subcommittee which heard the testimony on this item.

I have, however, read some of the testimony presented in the hearings of the committee. I am a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which the chairman is the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I cannot hear the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. While I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, which is under the chairmanship of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and which committee publishes monthly statistics on the increase or decrease in employment of the various Government agencies. It was based on those reports that I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that there have been added to the Department of the Interior a total of 5,694 new employees in the first 16 months of the new administration—that is, for the calendar year 1961 and the first 4 months of this year. Those are the latest figures we have.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What explanation has been given for the reasons which induced this increase in the number of approximately 5,500? Has any explanation been given why these 5,500 new employees have been added?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have seen no explanation. These are statistics alone. In my own opinion, there can be no reasonable justification for such an increase.

I recognize that some programs may, very properly, have increased cost, but certainly some others should have a corresponding decrease.

I call attention to the additional fact that the total amount of the Interior Deparment appropriations for fiscal 1961, including all the supplemental appropriations for that fiscal year, amounted to $754,536,700. In fiscal 1962, which was last year's appropriation, the bill as passed by the Senate carried a total of $795,791,650, or an increase last year of about $41 million over the preceding year.

If that were not bad enough, this bill calls for an additional $120,769,170 over the last fiscal year, or a total of $916,560,820.

If this bill is approved, even without the increases provided for in the pending amendments, it will mean an increase of 15 percent in appropriations for the Interior Department over that which was necessary 2 years ago. What kind of bureaucracy are we building?

I recognize that we have an unemployment problem, but certainly the New Frontiersmen have some solution other than putting them all on the Federal payroll.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD three editorials from western papers, one from the Salt Lake Tribune of June 7, 1962, entitled "Unwise Scuttling Plan," one from the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., for May 18, 1962, entitled "Congress Kicking West in Pants," and the last from the Wyoming State Tribune of May 26, 1962, entitled "Peculiar Wisdom." These discussions put the problem in a different perspective.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, June 7, 1962]

UNWISE SCUTTLING PLAN

The Senate Appropriations Committee proposal to cripple the already inadequate information and education service of the Bureau of Land Management is inconsistent and difficult to understand.

In its report on the Interior Department money bill for next year, the Senate committee increased most funds for land and resource management, recreation and conservation programs. But it recommended elimination of the information-education positions in each of the BLM's 11 western field offices and slashing the Washington information staff to 5 persons, including clerks. If the recommendation carries, the "stepchild of Interior," the least understood resource management agency in the Government, will be less able to tell its story than at present.

A relatively few Americans are aware that the BLM administers about 400 million acres of public land and is the Nation's largest landlord. Even fewer realize that the BLM operates at a profit, returning to the U.S. Treasury nearly $7 for every $1 appropriated.

"All through the years," says the Wildlife Management Institute, "the BLM has been a milking operation, with the Federal Government getting all the riches it can out of the national land reserve and making little effort to invest enough money back into the lands.

"One reason this situation continues is that the BLM never has been permitted to tell its side of the story."

The same Senate committee in 1960 said that the public domain lands "represent a major national asset" and recommended that resource programs be strengthened.

The 1962 recommendation of the committee would be a step in the opposite direction. We hope the full Senate rejects the scuttling proposal.

[From the Oregonian, May 18, 1962]

CONGRESS KICKING WEST IN PANTS

The Bureau of Land Management, for many years the unloved country cousin who had to eat leftovers in the kitchen of the U.S. Department of Interior, is taking another elbowing in Congress. The budget slashing and juggling of BLM in both the

House and Senate will be painful to Oregon and all the West if it isn't stopped.

Previously we reported here how the House rejected an item of $2 million, half to launch the Vale district range rehabilitation project in Malheur County as a major demonstration of how to make public lands carry more cattle and sheep, and half for range work elsewhere in Oregon. A Senate subcommittee restored $1 million for the Vale project, but the main committee harpooned it.

The BLM budget now reported to the Senate by its Appropriations Committee restores $700,000 of the House cuts in the administration's budget, but sustains a reduction of $1,400,000. The Udall budget for BLM was $41.5 million. The House cut this to $39.4 million. The Senate committee's recommendation is $40.1 million. This does not seem too bad, in total. But the trouble for Oregon lies in the nature of the cuts.

First, consider that the Bureau of Land Management, with about a $40 million annual budget, administers 477 million acres of Federal range and forest lands in the United States, this cost being about 8 cents an acre. BLM's revenues, which go to the Treasury, are estimated for next year at $383 million, mostly from oil and gas leases, of which $59 million will be paid to the States and counties. Grazing fees paid by stockmen amount to about $3 million a year. Forest reveunes, nearly all from the O & C lands in Oregon, approximate $28 million a year.

(The U.S. Forest Service, in the Department of Agriculture, has a House-approved budget of $269 million to administer 180 million acres of public lands).

Second, consider that 20 years ago Secretary of Interior Oscar Chapman estimated the cost of restoring rundown rangelands to obtain sustained carrying capacity for livestock at $400 to $500 million. The estimate of the cost today is $700 million. Very little has been spent in the 20 years to stop range depletion and reverse the trend. The BLM is woefully short handed. For each BLM technician, office and field, there are a half-million acres of range to be administered. Each district manager has an average million acres to protect and improve, if possible—and there is never enough money.

In some sections, the Senate Appropriations Committee this year was more generous than the sharp-knifed House. It restored a House cut of $635,000 to grant the full budget figure for lands and minerals administration, much of which will go to Alaska and southern California. It added $500,000 to the budget estimate for surveying, to meet Alaska's needs. But it sustained a House cut of $100,000 in general administration funds. Also, it:

1. Reduced by $300,000 the funds for range management and fire prevention.

2. Cut $500,000 from the funds for forest management—and 60 percent of BLM forest funds are used to manage the O. & C. lands in Oregon, the only sustained-yield forest program under this agency and the producer of almost all of the $28 million a year from timber sales.

3. Eliminated $129,800 for the information and education service long needed by the BLM and inaugurated in February. This means that the 12 fieldmen employed in this work of telling the people what BLM is doing and trying to do—one in each of 12 States—and probably 2 of the 5 I. & E. men in Washington, D.C., will be fired or transferred to other work.

The last item is curious. Some Members of Congress, even from the West, seem to resent that BLM has begun to inform the cattlemen, lumbermen, sportsmen, and the public generally about its plans and activities, though there seems not to be the same resentment of the small army of public relations men employed by the Forest Service. Senator HENRY DWORSHAK, of Idaho, is reported to have led the assault which resulted in the Senate committee's vote to abolish BLM's skeletonlike information program. The public deserves better treatment than this.

In fact, the BLM budget submitted by the Department of the Interior is a starvation budget in relation to range and forest needs and the cuts in Congress are unconscionable. As a minimum, these items, plus the money for the Vale project, should be restored. And the administration and Congress should give much more attention hereafter to the resources which must be brought to full productivity under BLM management. To say that there is a tremendous public demand for better use of public land is an understatement.

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, May 26, 1962]

PECULIAR WISDOM

The Bureau of Land Management is an agency that administers some 400 million acres of public lands, mostly located in the Western States.

Some 6 months ago it instituted a policy of stationing an information officer at each of its 11 western field offices, including the 1 in Cheyenne, to facilitate the handling of news and information about the Bureau's activities for public enlightenment.

Considering the plethora of public relations men who cluster about the Government departments in Washington, this is a modest undertaking indeed.

Now, however, the Senate Appropriations Committee for some reason has decided to lop off these BLM information and education officers and has so recommended this action in the Interior Department's appropriations bill for the next fiscal year.

Information officers for the most part perform a worthwhile service in keeping the public posted on the day-by-day doings in the Government agencies, and the further removed they are from Washington, the more effective they seem to be.

Starting a program of this nature and then suddenly ending it 6 months later appears to be shortsighted.

We are all for economy, but if this is a moneysaving move, it is sort of like storming the bastions of hell with a water pistol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 41, as follows:

[No. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Bartlett	Hart	Muskie
Burdick	Hickey	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Randolph
Carroll	Kefauver	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Dodd	Mansfield	Talmadge
Douglas	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ellender	McGee	Young, Ohio
Engle	Metcalf	
Gruening	Moss	

NAYS—41

Allott	Eastland	Morse
Anderson	Ervin	Morton
Beall	Fong	Mundt
Bennett	Goldwater	Pearson
Bible	Hayden	Prouty
Boggs	Holland	Proxmire
Butler	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Scott
Cannon	Keating	Smathers
Carlson	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Case, N.J.	Lausche	Symington
Church	Magnuson	Williams, Del.
Curtis	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Dworshak	Miller	

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Pell
Capehart	Javits	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston	Saltonstall
Chavez	Jordan	Stennis
Cooper	Kerr	Thurmond
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Tower
Dirksen	Long, La.	Wiley
Fulbright	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Monroney	
Hartke	Murphy	

So Mr. Moss' amendment was rejected.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS BILL CAN MAKE FUTURE LOOK BRIGHTER FOR WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was able to amend this bill in committee to include certain items which will be of great importance and benefit to my State of West Virginia. As a member of the subcommittee handling this bill, and as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I have offered six amendments, four of which were adopted.

The first and most purposeful of my amendments adds $1,450,000 to the requested budget for the Office of Coal Research. This additional money is needed by that Agency to permit vital coal research to go forward, and to aid the projects in which I have been actively interested for almost a year.

Specifically, $1 million is needed by the Office of Coal Research to speed up the work on Project Gasoline, one of the biggest coal research projects yet undertaken. This project involves a new method for processing coal to make synthetic oils, char—a semicoke—gases, and chemicals, and may prove to be the most successful research undertaken for new, large-scale uses of coal.

If the research on Project Gasoline is successful, then a pilot facility may be located in the area of Morgantown, W. Va. This, I am informed, would be followed by a commercial-type plant at Cresap, W. Va., which would use approximately 3 million tons of coal a year. Success of the envisioned Cresap plant could lead to the establishment of similar commercial plants in other areas of West Virginia, as well as in other coal States. The mining of coal for this new use would stimulate employment in an industry that has been hard hit by large-scale unemployment, and would also provide job opportunities for hundreds of persons in the commercial plants and in related chemical industries.

The other $450,000 which I was successful in adding to the Office of Coal Research budget is for Project Bootstrap. This project involves the feasibility of enriching coal with hydrogen through an electric process to make synthetic gases, oils, chemicals, and other products.

According to the Office of Coal Research, should the research and development work on Project Bootstrap prove successful—and early benchwork tests by scientists on the project are reported to be very satisfactory—then a pilot plant may be located in the Beckley, W. Va., area because of that city's central location in the large Appalachian coalfields.

A commercial-type plant, which may result from Project Bootstrap, would utilize approximately 2 million tons of coal a year, and would provide, among other products, pipeline gas for industrial and household use. Several such plants, built to provide pipeline gas for eastern and midwestern cities, would absorb large tonnages of coal. Thus, Project Bootstrap, like Project Gasoline, would not only give great new impetus to the coal mining industry of West Virginia, but would also create a variety of job opportunities for many persons in my State.

Project Bootstrap is an effort to explore the possibility of reacting hydrogen, methane—or similar gases—under corona with powdered coal to make pipeline gas, chemicals, and other products. If Project Bootstrap is successful, the ultimate commercial plant can be envisioned as an integrated chemical and energy installation utilizing only coal, water, and air as raw materials. Portions of the coal would be used to generate hydrogen and volatile gases, which would be fed to a reactor to create marketable gases and chemicals. Either the residual coke, or gas, from these operations would power a turbine to provide high frequency electrical energy and process steam to complete the cycle. I am informed that, if the current experiments lead to a construction of a pilot plant in the Beckley, W. Va., area, about 50 persons would be employed by that facility. A commercial-type plant would employ more than 100 persons, and would use approximately 7,000 tons of coal a day.

If Project Bootstrap proves successful, a great new era is in store for the coal industry, with the possibility of many commercial-type plants manufacturing gas from coal for pipeline transmission to many eastern and midwestern cities from the heart of West Virginia.

Another amendment which I was successful in adding to the appropriations bill deals with the westward extension of the Monongahela National Forest. My amendment provides the U.S. Forest Service with $125,000 with which to begin this expansion. An estimated 550,000 acres, or more, of land would be acquired in eight counties in West Virginia: Braxton, Fayette, Greenbrier, Lewis, Nicholas, Randolph, Upshur, and Webster.

The Monongahela National Forest is proving to be an outstanding economic asset to the State of West Virginia. It is a resource of ever-growing value. Its allowable cut of timber increases with each passing year. The number of people visiting its recreation sites, partaking of its fishing and hunting opportunities, has almost doubled in the past few years. All of this has meant greater revenues to the counties in or near the Forest.

Thus, an extension of the Monongahela National Forest would provide both short- and long-term economic benefits to the people in those areas where the expansion would take place. It is for this reason that I pressed for my amendment which would initiate extension of the forest.

Mr. President, the recreation and tourist industry is of greater significance to the economy of West Virginia than is commonly realized. The scenic grandeur of my State has often been described as unique in the eastern half of the United States. But much work must be done before the fullest possible potential from the natural attractions of my State can be realized. The incompleted Bowden National Fish Hatchery is a case in point.

Last year, my amendment to complete the Bowden Hatchery was not accepted by the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies. This year, however, I was successful in adding $62,000 to the Interior appropriations bill to get this facility finished.

The $62,000 will complete earthen ponds, service roads, landscaping, fencing, and drainage ditches, and will provide fish-culture equipment. Therefore, the present approximate annual production of 80,000 pounds of trout will be increased to an approximate 100,000 pounds—a production which will play a significant role in maintaining the cold-water sport fishery in West Virginia, and in preserving and developing this recreational resource.

Last year, I also offered an amendment to provide $150,000 for construction of a watershed management laboratory at Parsons, W. Va. The amendment was not accepted by the subcommittee. This year, the amendment was agreed to because the urgency of this project was recognized by committee members. Watershed management is rapidly becoming a national problem, and scientific research on this matter is vitally needed.

The facility at Parsons, which would be located within a short distance of the Fernow Experimental Forest, should prove to be a valuable asset in research for soil stability and streamflow. All Appalachian area cities and communities depending upon municipal water supplies, will eventually benefit from the work of this laboratory. Its findings will also be applicable to other areas in the United States.

I am happy to report, too, Mr. President, that the Appropriations Committee gave its approval to the budgeted request for $250,000 for construction and research work in connection with the Timber Marketing and Utilization Center at Princeton, W. Va. Last year, I was successful in amending the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill to establish this center. At that time, I obtained an initial $450,000 for necessary planning, engineering, and land acquisition.

This Center results from my interest in finding ways and means to utilize the vast stands of poorer grades of hardwood so common to much of the Appalachian region. When I called the attention of the U.S. Forest Service to this problem early last year, officials of that agency agreed that a solution was vital to the economy of the Appalachian area and to the future timber needs of our country.

Early last year, I toured several southern West Virginia counties with officials of the U.S. Forest Service to assist them in viewing several possible locations for the proposed center. After several months of study, the Princeton area was selected by the agency for the facility. The center should certainly prove to be a worthy addition to the economic growth of West Virginia, as well as other Appalachian States.

I am mindful, Mr. President, that all of my amendments to the Appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies must be agreed to in conference between the Senate and

the House of Representatives. I can only hope that the Senate will accept my amendments and that the Senate conferees will be successful in holding the amendments in conference with the House of Representatives. The people of West Virginia direly need the economic opportunities which my amendments offer to them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD, a letter addressed to me by Mr. George Lamb, Director of Coal Research, under date of June 1, 1962.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I was most pleased to learn of the successful committee action in approving your amendment for additional funds for the Office of Coal Research to accelerate Project Gasoline and Project Bootstrap.

Personally, I believe that Project Bootstrap is everything its name implies, and its success may well be the greatest thing that ever happened to the low volatile and other coalfields of West Virginia. Since the pilot plant for Project Bootstrap is planned to be located in the Beckley area, Project Bootstrap ultimately could mean a sizable economic renaissance for the Beckley area and successful commercialization of this process could mean employment for hundreds of miners.

I am sure that the people of West Virginia will take great cognizance of your efforts on behalf of Project Gasoline and Project Bootstrap.

Sincerely yours,

G. A. LAMB,
Director of Coal Research.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and my colleague from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$41,022,200" and insert "$43,022,200."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed to explain the amendment, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] has asked that I yield to him without losing my right to the floor, and with that understanding I am happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I desire to join with Senators who have already spoken and those who, I am sure, will speak later in commending the chairman of the committee for another magnificent job in bringing the Department of Interior appropriation bill to the floor of the Senate. As we all know, he has, of course, done more in making possible the development of the West during the many years he has been in the Senate than any other Member of the Congress.

I express special gratitude to the committee for increasing the amount of money in the bill for cadastral surveys to be made available to the Bureau of Land Management. Likewise I applaud the committee's action in restoring the full budget estimate for construction of school facilities for American Indians, including Indians in Alaska.

I have prepared statements on these two subjects, and since the Senator from Oregon has been so gracious as to yield to me, and in the interest of conserving time, I ask unanimous consent that the statements be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CADASTRAL SURVEYS

I was gratified to learn that the Appropriations Committee has recommended to the Senate a substantial increase in the amount to be made available to the Bureau of Land Management for cadastral surveys. The Bureau in its budget estimate for fiscal year 1963 estimated a requirement for $4,490,000 for all public land States. The House of Representatives reduced this amount by $265,000. In the bill as reported to the Senate the amount to be made available for cadastral surveys includes the $265,000 deleted by the House plus an increase over the estimate of the Interior Department of $500,000.

The approval of this increase is of the most extreme order of importance to the orderly development of land in Alaska. I am informed that Alaska's share of the increase recommended by the Appropriations Committee could possibly permit an additional 350,000 acres to be surveyed by survey lines running 350 to 400 miles. Most of these new survey lines would define the exterior boundaries of State land selections allowing early transfer to Alaska of land to which it is entitled under the Statehood Act. It will be recalled that the Alaska Statehood Act provided that by 1983 Alaska could select 103,350,000 acres of land.

It is necessary that survey of State land selections be completed in order that title may be transferred to the State. Alaska has selected about 11 million acres since statehood. By the close of the current fiscal year 36 percent, or 4 million acres, of current State selections will have been surveyed.

Under the budget estimate of the Bureau of Land Management the 1963 program would have allowed the survey of an additional 2.9 million acres. Even with the increased appropriation in the Senate bill by the end of fiscal year 1963 surveys will have covered less than 70 percent of the acreage already selected by the State. New selections which may be made by the State will naturally reduce the ratio of the area surveyed to the area selected by the State. The need for an accelerated survey program is imperative to permit the terms of the Statehood Act to be honored.

In addition to the need for prompt action on State land selections there is equally pressing need for early survey of Federal land subject to disposition under the general land laws. Public land surveys will share to some extent in the increased money made available in the Senate bill.

I would urge most strongly that the committee-recommended increases for cadastral surveys be approved.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Some of the major funds in the Interior appropriation bill are those for construction to provide additional schoolrooms and rehabilitate existing facilities for Alaska's native children. The Senate committee's action in restoring the full budget estimate is to be commended. So far as Alaska is concerned, this is most important. There are hundreds of our young people attending school in older buildings, many of which are deplorably dangerous or overcrowded. Last year's program was an admirable start, but the job to be done will suffer if the 1963 fiscal year request is cut in any way. Under the program the Alaska allocations would provide additional rooms for 420 children now without facilities, plus replacing facilities for 660 children for a total construction program of $3,498,000. The following table shows this construction program, exclusive of other planning or utility requests:

Locality	Budget request	Number of classrooms	Number of pupils
Alitak	$141,000	1	30
Eagle	159,000	1	30
Hooper Bay	519,000	7	210
Kiana	387,000	4	120
Kwethluk	230,000	3	90
Newktok	191,000	2	60
Noatak	378,000	4	120
Nondalton	219,000	2	60
Old Harbor	194,000	2	60
Oscarville	158,000	1	30
Scammon Bay	196,000	2	60
Stebbins	192,000	2	60
Tanunak	188,000	2	60
Tatitlek	186,000	2	60
Tetlin	160,000	1	30
Total	3,498,000	36	1,080

I have just received a letter from Nondalton written me by Mr. Nickoll Balluta and other members of the village council giving an excellent and most appealing example of what these funds mean to our native people. I urge that the committee recommendation of $55,550,000 be approved.

"In the May 17 issue of the Bristol Bay Digest the following article appeared.

"'Word just received from Washington, D.C., is that the Nondalton school project was part of the $3 million package removed from the Interior Department request.'

"Unless the Senate is able to restore this part of the budget, the school will be postponed. A new school building is needed here. The present school building is in very poor condition and is, we understand, the only school in the State heated by wood.

"In the winter the children at times have to keep their parkas and coats on. The wiring is so poor that when last checked, there were several places where the wires were bare and the wood scorched. How well this was remedied we do not know but we are glad that no fires were started.

"The present building has only one classroom and the State is renting the community building for a second classroom. This leaves the village without any place to have meetings, etc.

"There are about 50 students at present, while graduating 1, about 12 more will enroll this September. In 1963 there may be another 12 or so starting in the first grade. Then what?

"If there is anything you can do to help us get a new school we will appreciate it very much."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall attempt to explain the amendment. We have copies of the amendment and the statement, which will be distributed to Senators.

President Kennedy, in Senate Document No. 88, recommended that Congress appropriate $2 million to the Bureau of Land Management for range conservation for fiscal year 1963. I believe that this money is absolutely essential if we are ever going to move ahead vigorously with the orderly development of a valuable national resource—the now deteriorating range lands of the Western States. Because I believe the need is so pressing, I am now proposing an amendment to provide this money.

As I pointed out, I am joined in the amendment by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I know of no member of the Senate who is better informed on the problems of public lands than is the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am joined also by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who is well versed on our public lands problems, as Senators will observe in some comments I shall make shortly in my brief explanation and my colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER], who has lived with the conservation problem for many years in public service.

I point out specifically that my amendment would delete the figure "$41,022,-200" from page 2, line 10, and substitute the sum of "$43,022,200" in the bill, H.R. 10802, as it was reported to the Senate.

I have discussed the question with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He shares my view in regard to the amendment and desires to take it to conference if he receives the approval of the Senate.

I would like to describe briefly the background of this amendment and the reasons why I feel that its passage is so vital to our stake in the rehabilitation of the range.

For the past several years, along with other conservation-minded members of the Senate, I have worked toward modernization of the range policies of the Bureau of Land Management. What has the Bureau been doing? In a sense, it has been following what might be called a no home on the range policy, a policy that has drastically reduced livestock allowed under grazing permits and moved at a pace that is damaging to rehabilitation. The net result has been to force many small ranchers off the range. Many have been forced to the brink—and even over the brink—into bankruptcy. Meanwhile, soil, grazing and water resources on the land have continued to be used up.

NEW APPROACH TO A SERIOUS PROBLEM

The conservation program on which I have been working—as have many of my colleagues from the West—is essentially a new approach to a very serious problem. It is not necessarily a novel approach, however. In the simplest possible terms, we believe that if something is broken and is worth fixing, the only reasonable course of action is to go ahead and fix it.

Our program calls for the fixing up of rundown ranges so they can carry livestock and game, serving, thereby, the needs of those who presently want to use the land. Our program also calls for protection of the thin mantle of soil from erosion losses, serving, thereby, to fix up the land for future use. These, then are the benefits foreseen under our program: For the present generation, the land will contribute to the economic welfare of the ranching communities—to the cash registers along main street; for coming generations, a vital natural resource will be protected.

TWO-PRONGED ATTACK IS ENVISIONED

Our concern with orderly development policies has been expressed in a two-pronged attack on the problem of deteriorating rangelands. Before the Eisenhower administration left office I requested special funds with which to rehabilitate burned-over rangelands. These funds were appropriated. When the Kennedy administration came into office, I urged, first, that the rehabilitation of burned-over rangelands be a part of a regular appropriation request. This is now the policy of the administration and of this Congress. Second, I have urged that we undertake a program designed to rehabilitate eroded and worn out rangeland, giving special attention to those areas where range cuts were pending or where wildlife needs were not being met.

The present Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Carver, represented the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] as his assistant, while the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] conducted hearings at Boise on the effect of range cuts on livestock permitholders in Idaho. These hearings proved to be of tremendous help; they supplied us with facts indicating an urgent need for positive action.

I thank the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] for the assistance he has rendered in the development of the range program.

Our attention was directed first of all to areas in the West—and there were many grazing districts affected—where range cuts were pending. Some of these cuts were scheduled to wipe out as much as 80 percent of the small ranchers' allotments, a reduction in acreage so severe that it would put these ranchers out of business.

ON-THE-GROUND INSPECTION TRIP

On several occasions last year, I met with Bureau officials and with the Secretary of the Interior to discuss what should be done. In addition, Representative ULLMAN and I made an on-the-ground inspection of rangeland in eastern Oregon.

Representative ULLMAN is the Representative from the eastern Oregon congressional district.

The problem in the Vale district is a particularly critical one—and I do not think it is any secret that this district has been one of the most serious trouble spots for the Bureau of Land Management. The stockmen in the area and the Bureau have often been at odds. However, during our visit, it became clear that the gap in thinking between the Bureau and the stockmen was not so wide after all, that what actually was involved was a lack of communication, and that the heart of the matter was a woeful lack of funds required by the Bureau to carry out its conservation responsibilities.

The solution to this problem became evident to all concerned during our inspection visit. It was universally agreed that the Bureau should develop a sound conservation program—a program not only for the Vale district but for all of the other grazing districts as well. However, all programs have to start somewhere, and, because of the substantial effort that already had gone into the Vale program, we felt that this was a logical place to start.

I wish to make clear that the program we are asking for today is not limited to the Vale grazing district. Unfortunately some misunderstanding has been caused. The whole rehabilitation range program of the administration has been called the Vale project because it started in the Vale grazing district of my State. It had that label attached to it, and the appropriation covers Idaho, Nevada, and New Mexico. It is a 7-year program, and it will cover all the public lands of the West before it is consummated.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I was interested by the last statement of the Senator that this is a 7-year program, and that it will cover the other public land States. I was also interested to note that in the sponsorship of the program the Senator was joined by the Senator from New Mexico, and there is money in the bill for New Mexico; by the Senator from Idaho, and there is money in the bill for Idaho; by the Senator from Nevada, and there is money in it for Nevada.

There are many areas in my State in which pilot projects might be very useful. I wonder why the sponsors did not consider other representatives areas in the 11 public land States, instead of leaving the impression that the matter has been tailor made to fit the sponsors of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will bear with me, I believe I can explain the bill and show that there is no intention at all in this program to discriminate against any State. We must start somewhere. Sometimes it is necessary to build a harbor in New York and not build one in Houston, although we will get to the Houston project as soon as we can. This is a project of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, who feel they are in a position to go forward with this as the first leg of a 7-year program. I shall explain that feature if the Senator will bear with me for a few minutes longer. Utah is included in the rehabilitation program. However, it is impossible to do it all in the first year.

Mr. BENNETT. Apparently it can be done only for those who sponsor the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe the Senator means to be unfair, but he is unfair

in effect by what he says. There was no such intention, of course. We have worked on this with the National Advisory Council under the Taylor Grazing Act. This is not a Wayne Morse bill. This is not a Clint Anderson bill. This is a bill of the National Advisory Council, under the Taylor Grazing Act. It is their bill. We merely introduced the bill. They perfected the program, and made the proposal that we start in these areas, because there is a very serious need to start here. There is a serious need elsewhere also, but comparatively speaking it is the judgment of the advisory council that we should start with this program. I want the Senator from Utah to know that there is no attempt on the part of the sponsors of the bill to discriminate against Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. It is unfortunate that there was not at least one other State included which did not have its representative as a sponsor of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. The bill is the bill the President submitted in behalf of his advisory council.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not a fact that since the receipt of the President's message the Senator from Oregon merely called other Senators to ask them to join as sponsors, because their States were involved?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is nothing proposed by these States.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. I wish to say that all the blame should fall on me, not on my cosponsors, because when I offered the bill I spoke to the other Senators and said I would offer the bill and that they would probably want to give some support by their cosponsorship of the bill. I did it hurriedly. If have offended any Senator from any other State, I apologize. That is how it happened in the rush of affairs here. I was offering the bill, and I asked other Senators if they would cosponsor it.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Colorado is interested in this proposal. The junior Senator from Colorado assumes that the National Advisory Committee has made a recommendation with respect to certain States. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. It made a recommendation for the whole public domain. They made the recommendation that we start with these projects.

Mr. CARROLL. Was there a recommendation with respect to Colorado?

Mr. MORSE. Not in the first year. It will be included in the 7-year program.

Mr. CARROLL. I understood that Colorado was not included in the beginning of the program. I shall look into it more closely to see why Colorado, which has grazing lands as extensive as some of the other States, was not included. Perhaps we do not have the same degree of conservation problems.

Mr. MORSE. My judgment is that the ranges in Colorado are not in as bad shape as in the States that are included in the program for the first year. A need exists for the program throughout the West. It is spread over a 7-year period.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I appreciate the explanation of the able Senator from Oregon. I will look further into this matter. I want to assure the able Senator from Utah that I was not about to be bypassed with respect to this conservation practice, either. I had understood, however, that Colorado was not one of the States initially designated for inclusion in the program.

Mr. MORSE. For the first year. The Senator from New Mexico suggested that at this point I read to the Senate the communication from the President of the United States, which I read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 19, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 involving an increase in the amount of $2 million for the Department of the Interior.

The details of this amendment, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for its submission at this time are set forth in the enclosed letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Further, it is merely carrying out the substantial proposals in the Taylor Grazing Act.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of 1934.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is all this does. It applies to area where the range is poor and starts with the rehabilitation which the Taylor Act proposed when we passed it in 1934.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS INVITED HERE

As a result of our talks in the area, Interior Secretary Udall and Assistant Secretary Carver early this spring invited members of the Vale Advisory Board, along with several members of the State and National advisory boards, to Washington, D.C. The discussions that followed were fruitful ones—and the meeting between high-level officials, practical conservationists and stockmen was in itself an important first step toward orderly range management policies.

Included in these discussions were National Advisory Board members, Dee Brownfield from New Mexico, Brunel Christensen from California, Henry Gerber of Klamath Falls, Oreg., and Charles Quaintance of La Grande, Oreg. Also present were members of the Oregon State Advisory Board. Bill Ross, the chairman of the Vale Advisory Board, presided at the meeting. This group spent almost a week going over in detail the proposed range rehabilitation plan for the Vale district. The conservationists and stockmen were not looking at it only as a Vale plan, however. They were looking at it as a model, or pilot program, that could be applied in any range district.

After completing its exhaustive study, the group approved the program without reservation. Concurrently, I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee and requested that an additional $2 million be made available for areas where range surveys indicated a need to reduce grazing use or where wildlife demands could not be met under existing range conditions. I explained that the cheat grass range should be replanted with crest grass, that safebrush should be eliminated, that water supply development and fencing should be undertaken—that all of these steps should be taken under a cooperative management program to assure proper utilization of the range. I also discussed this matter with President Kennedy.

PRESIDENT TRANSMITS BUDGET REQUEST

Subsequently, the President transmitted to Congress a formal budget amendment asking for a $2 million appropriation for this program.

I think it was the case, and unfortunately so, that some members of the committee on appropriations believed that the money was to be spent entirely in Oregon. This is not correct. I must assume or share the responsibility for that, because although I thought I had explained it to the Committee on Appropriations, I did not see all the members of that committee. I think some misunderstanding arose from the fact that all the members of the committee were not apprised of what the plan really covers.

The facts are set forth in a statement from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior. I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with pertinent letters.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In further reference to my letter of May 14, 1962, I am pleased to inform you that the program for the rehabilitation of range lands in the Western States has been considered by the Bureau of the Budget. Neither the Bureau of the Budget nor this Department have objection to the distribution of the proposed work as outlined in the enclosure of my letter of May 14.

A letter is being sent to Senator HAYDEN requesting restoration of the program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In accordance with your request there is enclosed a program for rehabilitation of range lands in the Western States.

The enclosed material outlines a range improvement program along the lines presented in your testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARVER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT—ADDITIONAL DATA REGARDING BUDGET AMENDMENT 1963 FOR ACCELERATED RANGE REHABILITATION ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Many years of heavy use by wildlife and domestic livestock, wild fires, and other abuses accentuated by droughts and wind and water erosion have destroyed much of the vegetative cover on the public lands. Over 30 percent of the rangelands are in poor or bad condition. Only 20 percent is improving while the balance is static or becoming worse. Livestock operators are facing continual reductions in herd numbers because of dwindling forage production. Livestock is the backbone of the economy in greater portions of the Western States and reduction in livestock numbers create a difficult situation not only for the range livestock producer, but also for communities in the area. Destruction of the vegetative cover has further resulted in the deterioration of watersheds. Irreplaceable soil is being lost from the range through sheet and gully erosion, and uncontrolled runoff from these watersheds is causing downstream losses and destruction by flooding and sedimentation.

The only alternative to permanent reductions in grazing use and continued flood and sediment damages downstream is the restoration of these lands to full productivity. The Vale district in Oregon, the Boise district in Idaho, the Winnemucca district in Nevada, and the Rio Puerco drainage in the Albuquerque district in New Mexico symbolize many of the major problems in present day Federal land resource management. Production can be restored in these areas by the intensive application of already proven treatments and practices. These project areas will constitute pilot areas of significant size to furnish much needed demonstrations of the value of effective conservation management on our national land.

VALE DISTRICT, OREG.

Acceleration of the rehabilitation of the range resources in the Vale district requires the application of vegetative improvement projects coupled with fences, livestock water and other facilities for the protection, management and use of range areas during and following treatment. The following are major practices which will be accomplished during the first year of the project:

Practice	Unit	Units to be accomplished
Range seeding	Acre	13,000
Brush control	do	16,000
Fencing	Mile	50
Water developments	Number	40
Range use facilities	do	16

BOISE DISTRICT, IDAHO

Restoration of resources on the public lands in the Boise district requires the accelerated application of those practices which will result in the improvement of the vegetative cover. The soil and climate are conducive to vegetative growth and lend themselves to established methods of range seeding and brush control. Water developments and range facilities for the protection and management of improved areas are also needed.

The following major accomplishments are planned for the first year of the project:

Practice	Unit	Units to be accomplished
Range seeding	Acre	6,000
Brush control	do	8,000
Fencing	Mile	30
Water developments	Number	20

WINNEMUCCA DISTRICT, NEV.

The invasion of brush and other undesirable plants following heavy grazing in the Winnemucca district requires that brush and weed control measures be intensified to restore watershed values and forage production. Perennial grasses over much of the area have been reduced in abundance until adapted species must be established to replace them. Rehabilitation must consist of brush and weed control supported by water development, fencing and other range use facilities needed in protecting treated areas and enabling the establishment of sound systems of grazing management. The following major accomplishments are planned for the first year of the project:

Practice	Unit	Units to be accomplished
Range seeding	Acre	8,500
Brush control	do	11,000
Fencing	Miles	35
Water developments	Number	25

ALBUQUERQUE DISTRICT, N. MEX. (RIO PUERCO)

More than 500,000 acre-feet of soil has been scooped out of valley fill and scalped from the upland topsoils in the Rio Puerco drainage, creating havoc locally and downstream. A number of villages have been abandoned, irrigation farming has had to be abandoned and grazing drastically reduced. The Rio Puerco contributes over half the silt which obstructs the channel of the Rio Grande and fills the basin of Elephant Butte Dam, but only one-sixteenth of the water. Corrective measures involve temporary impoundment of flood runoff near its source by land treatment measures such as contouring, deep ripping and by detention and diversion dams. Treated areas also require protection from uncontrolled grazing use. The following accomplishments are planned for the first year of the project:

Practice	Unit	Units to be accomplished
Detention dams	Number	25
Diversion dams	do	14
Fences	Mile	70
Land treatment	Acre	8,000

Funds required by activities

Location: Districts	Management of lands and resources			Construction		Total
	Management	Soil and moisture	General administration	Roads	Buildings	
Vale	$290,000	$510,000		$35,000	$165,000	$1,000,000
Boise		200,000		15,000	85,000	300,000
Winnemucca		250,000				250,000
Albuquerque—Rio Puerco		425,000				425,000
General administration			$25,000			25,000
Total	290,000	1,385,000	25,000	50,000	250,000	2,000,000

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that the Boise district of the Bureau of Land Management would be allotted $300,000 of this money, the Winnemucca district in Nevada, $250,000, the Albuquerque-Rio Puerco district in New Mexico, $425,000 and the Vale district, $1 million.

The reason for the larger allocation to the Vale district lies in the fact that a detailed plan has been prepared, and the Bureau is presently in a position to get started with a more definitive long-term range development program than might be possible elsewhere. I wish to make it clear that that is on a priority acreage basis.

The Vale district is as large as the State of Rhode Island, and the expenditures contemplated to complete range rehabilitation ultimately will total several million dollars. However, when the program is completed, the carrying capacity of this range for livestock and game will have been increased severalfold. There will also have been developed a sensible program of soil and water conservation and recreational use that will serve as a valuable model for the improvement of districts with similar problems.

IMPORT COMPETITION FACTOR CITED

Recently the Senate considered H.R. 10788, dealing with textile imports. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], proposed an amendment providing that import controls on lamb, beef, and other products would have to be imposed before the cotton agreements could go into effect. I am in favor of all proper efforts to protect domestic producers against competition from low-cost imports. I cosponsored the amendment placing this matter before the President. The problem of lamb and beef imports has a direct bearing on the range rehabilitation program which the Senate is considering today, for range rehabilitation offers a solution to the problem of import competition without imposition of controls.

The livestock industry is the backbone of the economy in large areas of the Western States. A reduction in livestock population means higher prices for the consumer, and this, in turn, means economic hardship in the ranching communities. Range development is not a subsidy; it is a program designed to allow American ranchers to produce the meat we need at reasonable prices, enabling them at the same time to remain competitive with foreign producers.

In short, range rehabilitation is a practical program for cooperation between ranchers and their government to insure wise management of public lands. The Federal share of the cost would be invested in reseeding the range. The stockmen would be required to invest their labor in water supply development, fencing, and other improvements. They would also be required to cooperate in improving grazing practices. And the benefits would be shared by all of us, today and in the future.

THE SITUATION TODAY IS CRITICAL

At present, the situation is critical. The Secretary of the Interior advises us that over 30 percent of the public rangelands now are in poor condition. Even more significant, 80 percent of our rangelands are either not improving—they are stagnating—or they are deteriorating. We must halt this wasteful use of the public lands.

The Taylor Grazing Act, on the books since 1934, provides the authority required for rangeland conservation. It is up to us now to provide the money. The four areas covered by my amendment in support of the President's program offers us an opportunity to concentrate our efforts in areas of known difficulty. Our experience in these areas then can be put to good use elsewhere.

I have received numerous telegrams and letters from Oregonians regarding this program. They indicate clearly a desire on the part of the local people to work cooperatively with the Government on this important range conservation proposal. Among local supporters are not only ranchers, but bankers, chambers of commerce, production and credit associations, and county officials. I ask unanimous consent that some of these expressions of interest from my State be set forth at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALE, OREG., *May 11, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senate committee refusal to approve funds for proposed Vale project is severe blow to conservation. Rehabilitation of public range is only salvation for wildlife, recreation, and livestock interests. This investment in the public's resources is long overdue. With Vale district as a pilot program the entire Nation will benefit. This opportunity may never occur again, so urge your enthusiastic effort to get funds appropriated.

WILLIAM G. ROSS,
President, Malheur County Livestock Association and Chairman Vale District Advisory Board.

VALE, OREG., *May 11, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Senate committee refusal to approve funds for proposed Vale project is severe blow to conservation. Rehabilitation of public range is only salvation for wildlife, recreation, and livestock interests. This investment in the public's resources is long overdue. With Vale District as a pilot program the entire Nation will benefit. This opportunity may never occur again so urge your enthusiastic effort to get funds appropriated.

D. E. MASTERSON,
President, U.S. National Bank of Portland, Vale Branch.

ONTARIO, OREG., *May 11, 1962.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Sorry to hear your Appropriations Committee eliminated Vale seeding project which meant renewed life for our livestock industry and indirectly to wildlife and recreation. Our public ranges have been in need of such attention for years. This project would serve as pilot for other Western States, so imperative it be reinstated. Warm regards.

ONTARIO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

VALE, OREG., *May 11, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.:

The county court of Malheur County firmly believes that the appropriation before the Senate Department of the Interior Appropriations Committee concerning the pilot program BLM lands comprising the Vale, Oreg., grazing districts of vital importance to the improvement and maintenance of these lands and the appropriations is for the benefit for all concerned.

MALHEUR COUNTY COURT,
ELLIS A. WHITE, *County Judge.*

BAKER, OREG., *May 16, 1962.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We urge your continued support in procuring a reasonable amount necessary to rehabilitate the Vale, Oreg., range project.

BAKER PRODUCTION CREDIT ASSOCIATION,
EARL HEIZER, *Manager.*

PRINEVILLE, OREG., *May 18, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Oregon cattlemen reaffirm favorable reaction to Vale project appreciate your interests and efforts in new attack advise if any help needed.

OREGON CATTLEMENS ASSOCIATION,
GEORGE W. JOHNSON,
Executive Secretary.

ONTARIO, OREG., *May 19, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D.C.:

Malheur County Livestock Association strongly urges reinstatement of appropriation for range rehabilitation pilot program in this area. At least 75 percent beef cattle operations in district dependent upon public range for summer feed and must have relief from imposed use reductions to remain a healthy industry in the future. The economy of entire western region seriously affected and dependent upon the livestock industry and therefore upon a progressive range rehabilitation program as to be inaugurated if funds made available.

WILLIAM G. ROSS, *President.*

RESOLUTION

Whereas the administration has proposed a cut of $100 million in funds, for the agriculture conservation stabilization program for the coming year; and

Whereas this money is primarily used for actual conservation of farmland, and erosion control; and

Whereas the average farmer does not have sufficient funds, or equipment to combat the floods, droughts, and other elements of nature: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Ashbutte Grange No. 802 duly assembled this 14th day of April 1962, go on record as requesting these funds to be continued.

CHARLES J. KEEGAN,
Master.
GERTRUDE FINNELL,
Secretary.

ASHWOOD, OREG.

OREGON DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
May 28, 1962.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are enclosing an editorial from the Oregonian of May 18 and it so happens that this editorial expresses the views of the Oregon division in respect to the subject of the cuts in the budget for the Bureau of Land Management.

We wish to make specific objection to the elimination of the $129,800 for the Information and Education Service of the BLM.

Your consideration of the enclosure and your support in assisting the sustaining of the BLM budget would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

ALLAN L. KELLY,
President.

VALE, OREG., *May 15, 1962.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE.
Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER.
Representative EDITH GREEN.
Representative AL ULLMAN.
Representative WALTER NORBLAD.
Representative EDWIN DURNO.

DEAR SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES: In regard to the Bureau of Land Management pilot plan formulated this year in Washington, D.C., we are deeply confused about the information given you resulting in the refusal to appropriate the financing essential to completion of such a needed program. Money, heretofore appropriated in this field, has done little toward any concrete development of these rangelands other than administrative costs. The area is large and has two major services to give eastern Oregon—wildlife and stock grazing. The lifeblood of the cattle industry depends upon proper grazing. The raising of stock has long been a major industry in eastern Oregon and, as such, should merit the deepest consideration of Congress. It is well to be fully aware that eastern and western Oregon have small resemblance in any field.

You already have a copy of the recommendation made this last March 24 in Corvallis, Oreg., at the direction of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in reviewing the Bureau of Land Management pilot plan. We enclose a copy of same.

Our local Malheur County Chapter of the Izaak Walton League is also sponsoring this spendid and workable program, and we are in the position of being well informed at the very source of its need. Regardless of party affiliation we feel every potential of the rehabilitation program was adequately investigated by Senator WAYNE MORSE and Representative AL ULLMAN and so reported to Congress.

The Izaak Walton League of America serves no purpose other than the "good of the whole" and, as such, has made this recommendation following information from all sources. We do not go into lengthy details concerning statistical matters already in your files, but we in this area do know the merits in the pilot program and the urgent need to the future maintenance of our great cattle industry.

Respectfully yours,

JOE F. BEACH,
President, Izaak Walton League, Malheur County Chapter, Vale, Oreg.

MARCH 28, 1962.

Senator WAYNE MORSE.
Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER.
Representative EDITH GREEN.
Representative AL ULLMAN.
Representative WALTER NORBLAD.
Representative EDWIN DURNO.

DEAR SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES: On March 24, the directors of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walter League of America reviewed the Bureau of Land Management pilot plan for demonstration of range rehabilitation potentials on the Vale Grazing District of Oregon.

The attached resolution was unanimously adopted, and the division urges your support in securing the necessary appropriations and authority for execution of this $16 million pilot project.

The qualifications stated in the resolution are explained, as follows:

1. Livestockmen must cooperate: It is a matter of record that permittees in the Vale district have successfully resisted the Bureau's efforts to adjudicate grazing on the basis of range carrying capacity for many years. This being the case, it appears that substantial expenditures of public funds would be a waste unless the permittees are willing to accept the type of management that would assure maintenance of the rehabilitated areas,

2. Priority should be given to units that have been voluntarily adjudicated: The league is concerned for the fact that emphasis of work in the Vale district is not necessarily fair to the permittees in other districts who have voluntarily cooperated in grazing adjudication and range improvement programs. However, the Solier Creek and Mahogany units within the Vale district have been adjudicated.

3. Program should be broader than grass rehabilitation: Although the Bureau's plan provides for construction of access roads, fences, waterholes, and recreational facilities, the emphasis appears to be upon spraying of sage brush and planting of perennial grasses. It is anticipated that rehabilitation of grasses will benefit cattle and perhaps antelope, but the elimination of shrubs could have a detrimental effect upon deer, sage grouse, and domestic sheep if the requirements of these animals are not fully considered in the design of the program.

The plan provides in principle for all of the above qualifications; however, the Izaak Walton League desires to clearly define the necessity for these provisions.

Your assistance in this constructive effort to improvement the renewable resources upon public lands will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

OREGON DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

ALLAN L. KELLY, *President*.

Copies to: Secretary of the Interior, Director of Bureau of Land Management, Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Senate Appropriations Committee, House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, House Appropriations Committee.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., has repeatedly urged multiple-use management and development of Federal lands to better serve all people through protection and enhancement of renewable resources; and

Whereas Bureau of Land Management Director Landstrom and his staff have prepared a pilot plan for the orderly restoration of forage and other resources upon Federal lands in Oregon; and

Whereas the success of the plan is dependent upon adequate Federal appropriations and local cooperation of all interested parties, including the persons grazing livestock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division, the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., by action of its directors in regular meeting at Corvallis, Oreg., this 24th day of March 1962, endorses the proposed plan with the following qualifications and recommendations:

1. That no public funds shall be spent for the enhancement of grazing upon any allotment until the benefiting permittees agree to maintain livestock numbers and seasons of use at a level that will permit successful completion of rehabilitation projects and preclude further injury to ranges that are not being directly treated.

2. That the grazing units which have voluntarily cooperated in grazing adjudications and other constructive programs be given a priority in the range improvement program.

3. That forage species other than grass and the requirements of animals other than cattle also be given consideration in the design of this pilot project.

(Adopted by Oregon division, Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., March 24, 1962, Corvallis, Oreg.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I know that many members of the Committee on Appropriations favor this much-needed program. The committee chairman, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] worked long and hard on its behalf. It is my hope that the Senate will now vote favorably on this appropriation and will instruct the conferees to stress its importance to the establishment of sound conservation practices, in furthering the economic welfare of our Nation—and in preserving a "home on the range" for the ranch families of the West.

Mr. President, I think I owe the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] an apology for an unintentional failure on my part to discuss the proposal with him when it was before the Committee on Appropriations. Frankly, I did not know exactly when the subject would come up before the committee. I work at the same pace at which the Senator from Idaho works. I was not aware that he was not familiar with all the details of the project. But that does not excuse me for not apprising him that it involves the Boise district as well as the Nevada and New Mexico districts. I hope the Senator from Idaho will understand that my failure to talk with him was not an intention on my part to perform an "end run" around him.

Nevertheless, I believe the project is of as vital concern to Idaho as it is to Oregon and to other States. I assure the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] again that under the Grazing Act we are starting a 7-year program that will be spread to the other parts of the public domain.

I put a simple question to the Senate: Do we want to appropriate the money recommended by the experts in the Department of the Interior and by the Advisory Council, working under the Taylor Grazing Act, for a program which, in their opinion, would restore the range and bring back into production a range which has now deteriorated? I think this would be a wise expenditure of money. I say most respectfully that I believe this program is more important than some other proposals for the enlargement of the Bureau's budget. I think this proposal should come first. I hope the Senate will share my view and will support the amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Is it not true that this is a cooperative program?

Mr. MORSE. It is a cooperative program. There is one point that I missed; I shall cover it in a moment. This is a cooperative program. Those who will benefit by it will have to spend for water holes and for fencing; they will have to help with the eradication of sagebrush, with spraying, and, in some cases, with controlled burning.

I do not wish to bore the Senate with a long discussion of some of the problems of range rehabilitation, but I should like to stress one point. Many persons seem to have the notion that to rehabilitate the range, all that is necessary is to take off all the livestock and put an end to all wildlife on the range. There could be no surer way of deteriorating the range. The conception that if all grazing on the range were stopped, the range would replace itself is erroneous. I could take Members of the Senate to the great experiment stations in the West. For example, at the Squaw Butte Experiment Station can be seen a large area of land on which there has not been a set of grazing teeth since 1936. Across the fence is similar land that has been carefully grazed since 1936. That is the finest type of grazing land. But the land which has not been grazed has deteriorated. The plants have died out. It goes into bunch grass. Senators who know what bunch grass is know that the heart of the bunch grass is in the center of the plant. The best way to replenish bunch grass is to clip it; and it is best clipped with sets of grazing teeth. The range cannot be rehabilitated by letting bunch grass so unranged. That is a misconception which I find to be very prevalent when I talk with persons who are not familiar with range problems.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] has raised a pertinent point by stating that this is a cooperative program.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I wholeheartedly associate myself with him in supporting this amendment. It is very easy to explain why the Winnemucca district in my State of Nevada was included in this particular proposed legislation.

For the past 3 years Nevada has suffered one of its all-time worst droughts. The range has run down to such an extent that cuts of as much as 40 percent in range rights were threatened. This is true of the Vale District, and I think it is also true of the district in New Mexico and the district in Idaho. This program pays many times its cost, in dividends. In Nevada we are not unfamiliar with the reseeding program. It is a program on which the funds used are very well spent. I recall several reseeding projects in my own State and in other States which also were hit with drought. That was 2 or 3 years ago; and I believe I am correct in saying that by proper reseeding, the carrying capacity is improved by approximately 7 or 8 times what it is today.

There is another point which needs to be stressed in connection with this program: It is one of the very fine means of controlling and eradicating halogeton, which is one of the great scourges of the Western States.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. In this connection, the question can properly be asked, Why did not this item receive the approval of the Appropriations Committee? The Senator is a member of the committee——

Mr. BIBLE. That is true; and I voted for the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. But I believe that as a member of the committee, the Senator will agree with me when I state that when the item was considered in the Appropriations Committee, it was very doubtful whether all the members of the committee understood that this project covers several States, and is only the first leg of a 7-year program; and some members had the misconception that because the item bears the label "Vale project", it is solely an Oregon project. Of course, if it had been solely an Oregon project

and if the entire amount of money had been allowed for only that part of the project, the item still would have been justifiable. But this is not a 1962 program for the senior Senator from Oregon. I have been battling for this kind of range rehabilitation during all my years in the Senate. I have been assisted by my colleagues from Oregon, as they have served with me, in connection with the range-rehabilitation program—not only by the present junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], but also by her husband, the late Senator Dick Neuberger. We have worked for this kind of range rehabilitation program, not for Oregon, but for all the West. Now we have an opportunity to put into operation this sound program, under the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act.

Mr. BIBLE. I am thoroughly in accord with the Senator from Oregon. I amplify his statement by saying that what is good for the Vale district, in Oregon, and for the Winnemucca district, in Nevada, is also good for all the other Western States. This program is one to increase efficiency and eradicate disease and erosion; and it will actually result in a saving in the long run. In my State, in this particular district, there are many small cattlemen; I think there are 150 permittees in the Winnemucca district. They are mainly small operators; and if they are faced with a cut of 70 percent, we know what the result will be: They will be wiped out; they will be forced into bankruptcy. This kind of program gives them a chance to continue on the range and to make a living.

Mr. MORSE. Of course the Senator from Nevada knows that when he talks about what these cuts do to the small family ranchers—those with from 75 to 300 head of cattle as their total source of income—it is clear that if a cut is made in their herds, not only will all their income be destroyed, but all of the value of their base ranch will also be destroyed. They may have 2,000 or 3,000 acres of sagebrush land, but the value of their homestead lies in the ability to graze their cattle there, and without this program that land will become absolutely valueless. That is the problem which the Federal Government is seeking to solve with the Council, under the Taylor Grazing Act; and that is the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I am delighted to associate myself with the Senator from Oregon on this amendment. It is for a pilot program which would benefit all the grazing States. As such, this project should go forward.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I realize the importance of the work the Senator from Oregon has done on this project.

The Chairman of the National Advisory Board is a Colorado man, and I know that there is great concern in Colorado in regard to this program. I have been informed by the Deputy Director of the Bureau of Land Management, who also is a Colorado man, that there is need for this program in Colorado, not next year, but this year.

I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry, if I may:

If this amendment, which calls for an additional $2 million, is adopted, will the Bureau of Land Management itself determine where the projects will start?

Mr. MORSE. That is true.

Mr. CARROLL. I ask the Parliamentarian if that is true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has propounded a question which calls for a legal interpretation; he has not propounded a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I would not want anything in the record to indicate that the Bureau would be bound to allocate the funds to only certain States, because I think Colorado should be included. I believe that even more than the amount called for by the amendment should be appropriated, because several other States have equally serious problems of this sort. It is unfortunate that the junior Senator from Colorado was not consulted before the amendment was brought up, because he would have definitely advocated increasing the amount. I favor the amendment, and the Senator from Oregon is entirely correct. I do not want the Bureau of Land Management put in a straitjacket. I want it to be free to apply the funds where they are needed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I think we can assure the Senator from Colorado that the effect of this provision will be what he has just suggested.

The pending question is whether to adopt the amendment, which calls for an increase in the amount set forth on page 2 in line 10—in other words, to increase it from $141,022,200 to $43,022,200.

But the amendment does not provide in any way how the additional money is to be spent. The National Advisory Council, in considering the projects, naturally had to find projects ready and eligible to go under a cooperative arrangement; and it has estimated that $2 million could properly be used in this way.

But if the amendment is enacted and becomes law, I am certain that the Bureau will review the areas throughout the country and will select not only the ones which are ready to go, but also those most in need of this service. I am sure that Colorado will be included, because I am sure this service is badly needed there.

In my own State, a great deal of the silt being dumped at the dams comes from that part of the country. For example, it is obvious that such a project in Colorado is greatly needed at the Elephant Butte Reservoir, and that it would be of great merit.

The table set forth was presented in an effort to show that there is need in the various States for this much money, and more, and that in several years a great many States will be covered.

I am sure the Senator from Colorado is correct in believing that his State will receive attention in that connection; and I am sure I am correct in assuring him that the presentation being made this afternoon does not lock the door to the inclusion of any State, but is merely for the purpose of showing that there is definite need for at least this much money.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from New Mexico has said. At the same time I would rather lose in my effort to have this amendment adopted than leave this RECORD in the least uncertain or confused. I have tried my level best to give a very accurate account of how this project came into being.

I repeat that the amendment does not provide that so many dollars shall go to project A or to project B. But I did explain to the Senator how the project was born. A conference was held here. The National Advisory Council members' decision was to start range rehabilitation. As the Senator from New Mexico said, they looked at projects that were able and ready to be proceeded with. They said the recommendation would involve these projects and that we ought to start with a minimum of $2 million.

The Senator is quite right; the power rests in the Department of the Interior to reshuffle that money any way it wants to in regard to any project it wants to consider the first year; but I want the Senator from Colorado to know that their plan is to do these projects the first year, then to move into another group of States the second year, and another group the third year.

The whole project could be decimated by using so little money on a particular project that it would not do any good at all. So we have a problem as to whether or not we are going to underwrite a sound approach to the range rehabilitation program, range area by range area, or whether we are going to insist on diluting the amounts to be spent into such small sums that, in effect, the purpose will be defeated before we start.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Of course, what the Senator has said is true. I do not propose such a plan, but I do not propose, after the people of my State have been working on this problem for years, to have the junior Senator from Colorado stand by and say nothing and therefore have it implied that we do not need the assistance in our State, when, in fact, we do need it. I was informed a few moments ago that we need it as much as any other State, although perhaps not as much as Idaho.

Therefore, I want the RECORD to show I think that BLM should at least make a start in Colorado. I suppose other Senators could say the same about other States.

I am going to support the amendment. I have confidence in the Bureau of Land Management. I do not think they ought to pour most of the money into one area and do nothing in others. They could do some experimentation. Assistant Secretary of the Interior, John Carver, has said to me of this program, "We are

on the threshold of history." And he indicated Colorado projects would soon be included.

I think we understand one another. I do not want the Senator from Colorado to have implied a sense of approval of a series of projects in certain States set up by the National Advisory Board of Advisers, without expressing the deep concern of the people of Colorado about participation in the program.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator is quite right. I have not any doubt, knowing his ability, that he will see to it that adequate representation of Colorado is made to the Bureau of Land Management with regard to the program. I am also convinced that, once the Senator from Colorado sits down with representatives of the Bureau of Land Management, he is going to be delighted with what the program will mean to the State of Colorado, as Colorado comes under the range rehabilitation program.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I commend the Senator for his lucid explanation of the amendment. I wish to tell him I am greatly pleased to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

As the Senator very generously mentioned in his remarks, the grazing problem has become critical in Idaho, so much so that the distinguished junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], at my request, conducted hearings in Twin Falls, Idaho, 2 years ago, where no fewer than 60 or 70 witnesses, as I recall, came in to testify as to the drastic cuts which were threatened by the Bureau of Land Management in connection with grazing on the public range.

I should like to relate the proposed pilot program to conditions in Idaho. The amendment offered would restore $2 million needed by the Bureau of Land Management to improve and restore grazing lands in several Western States, including my own State of Idaho.

The quality of certain grazing lands in Idaho has been steadily deteriorating due to the lack of funds required to rehabilitate them. The condition of lands in the Boise district of Idaho is particularly severe. Cattle grazing has been restricted on these ranges, thereby working a hardship on both large and small ranchers. Restriction of grazing is a nonproductive answer to a very serious problem.

Under the provisions of the proposed amendment, $300,000 would be allotted by the Bureau of Land Management for range seeding, brush control, water development, and necessary fencing in the Boise district. Only through these positive measures of conservation can these lands be restored to serve the purposes of livestock production. Today livestock production is Idaho's No. 1 agricultural cash crop. Therefore, the importance of range rehabilitation and conservation to our ranchers cannot be overlooked.

Mr. President, the funds requested in this amendment are vital to the economic development of our Western States. Conservationists and ranchers in these States favor this program to combat grazing range deterioration in these critical areas.

So I am pleased to join the distinguished Senator from Oregon in cosponsoring the amendment. I want to commend him for the way he has undertaken to do what must be done to rehabilitate our rangeland. It is long past due, and this pilot program is a very promising start which, in the end, will bring great benefits to all the western public land States. I assure him I will be happy to do all I can to support him in this effort to help the sheep and livestock industry of the West.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator states very well the cause of Wyoming as he describes the grazing problem in his own State of Oregon. I can think at the moment of a particular area where this problem has been plaguing us, the Kirby Creek area in the Big Horn area of the State, where some of the stockmen can point to proposals of 80-percent cuts, which means, in effect, as the Senator knows, they must go out of business as a result.

I want to associate myself with the Senator from Oregon in this approach to troublesome questions that need not have become troublesome if the Bureau of Land Management had been willing to act on this problem at an earlier time.

I applaud the Senator from Oregon on his initiative in pressing this effort. I assure him full cooperation will come from those who represent Wyoming.

I hope this proposal will avoid the confusion that proposals of some of our leading groups suggest, particularly in the realm of conservation. Conservationists occasionally get exercised on the question. I think it is unfortunate that they do, because this is a question of the wise utilization of the range rather than wasting the resources of the range. The resources are being wasted if the range is not built up and utilized effectively in economic terms. I think if we can dissociate the question of good use of the range from the theory of some conservationists, we will get down to brass tacks on the issue at stake in the proposal of the Senator from Oregon. I commend him for his efforts in this regard.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it means a great deal to me to hear that statement, because I know the Senator knows the range problems of Wyoming, as does his colleague.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HICKEY. Knowing full well the way in which the senior Senator from Oregon thoroughly explores legislation before he introduces it, I have a couple of questions I would like to propound for the benefit of making a legislative record.

Considering what the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said and what the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said, and recalling a hearing some 3 years ago when I was Governor and was in Worland, Wyo., the question rises in my mind, with regard to the statement made by the senior Senator from Oregon, and the subsequent remarks of the Senator from New Mexico, as to the number of people who represented the areas that were indicated in his speech.

Under the subheading "Advisory Board Members Invited Here" the Senator lists a number of people from Western States, from the public-lands States. There is no mention of any person from Wyoming or representing any part of Wyoming.

Mr. MORSE. I interrupt the Senator to say that the Department called on the National Advisory Council, it being informed as to the nature of the problem, to send representatives to the meeting to speak on behalf of the Council. The National Advisory Council members really represented all of the States, in the sense that the National Advisory Council represents all the States.

Mr. HICKEY. I believe that answers one of my questions. The selection of those who represented the western areas was made by the Advisory Council, which includes all the public-lands States.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKEY. Having that in mind, and recalling what was said by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I interpreted that to mean that when the group met it presented specific problems in specific States, which totaled up to a need for the amount the Senator has indicated.

Mr. MORSE. I think it would be better to describe it in this way: There was a meeting with representatives of the Department of the Interior—with the Secretary, with the Assistant Secretary, with the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and with other officials in the Department—and they discussed the whole problem of how to get on with the job of rehabilitating the range. The recommendations as to the first step came from the Department of the Interior and not from the advisers, not from the Council. The Department agreed on the procedure for range rehabilitation, which involved great changes in past Bureau of Land Management policy. That is the contribution which the representatives of the Council made.

The program for the first pilot test came from the Department and not from the Council.

I should like to have the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] understand this thoroughly. I do not wish to have the RECORD place the responsibility for the suggested selection of pilot projects on the Council. That is the responsibility of the Department of the Interior.

As the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, this is subject, of course, to further discussions with the Department of the Interior. It is not fixed and certain. It was said, "These are projects we are in a position to go ahead with because there is a clear indication of cooperation and the local participation which is necessary."

Mr. HICKEY. That answers my second question, and pinpoints the fact that the selection of the area was specifically done by the Bureau of Land Management.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKEY. I sincerely appreciate the answers of the senior Senator from Oregon. I say to the Senator, as a former secretary of one of the first Taylor grazing boards in the State of Wyoming, I recall that at the time of Mr. Ferry Carpenter, who I am sure the senior Senator from Oregon well knew, there was an intention that the philosophy propounded by the senior Senator from Oregon be the philosophy in the control and management of the public range.

I am most happy to associate myself with the senior Senator from Oregon, even at this late date, in pinpointing the kind of things we need, which have so long been overlooked in the management of the range in a proper fashion, which will do as was indicated by my colleague [Mr. McGEE]. We must eliminate the cuts which have caused so much difficulty.

The meeting to which I first referred was held at Worland, Wyo., at which we had representatives.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Wyoming about the conservation philosophy of the Senator from Oregon, which, as I say, has been shared by my colleagues in Oregon. I wish to stress that this was a program unanimously recommended by the people from the range themselves, represented by the State and National Advisory Councils. That was their program.

I quite agree with the Senator. They pointed out over and over again at the conferences, "This is what the Taylor Grazing Act envisioned in the first place." They urged that the Department get back to its original plan.

If I may, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], and of other Senators, because I had started on a point and I was diverted from it. I did not mention one other phase of the voluntary participation on the part of the ranchers themselves.

I need not tell anyone from the Western States that one of the most controversial issues raised from time to time is the issue of grazing fees. This was thoroughly discussed. There is not any question, I say to the Senators from the Western States, it is contemplated that as we go forward with this kind of program the grazing fees will be raised—and should be. Grazing fees will be raised—and should be.

When the representatives of the ranchers sit down in the kinds of conferences which have been held, they recognize this is to be expected. All they say is, "If we go through with the rehabilitation program such as is proposed, there will be range in sufficient quantity to justify a raising of the grazing fees, and the increase in the grazing fees will be plowed back into the Treasury of the United States and will help to resuscitate the range from the standpoint of increased income from the fees."

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the statement I gave in February 1960 before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with fiscal year 1961 funds for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MORSE. I think it would be a good idea to have the statement again printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CARROLL. I said at the time, referring to fiscal year 1961.

Colorado ranchers are concerned about the budget estimate reduction of $481,400 in the Soil & Moisture Conservation program of the Bureau of Land Management.

The purpose of my statement was to call attention to the soil and moisture conservation program and its relationship to Colorado.

I point out that I sought $4,252,000 in fiscal year 1961. The Senate gave us $5 million, but this was cut to about $3.7 million in conference. The program was slipping badly behind in its 20-year schedule. I am pleased to see that this year the conservation program to help western cattlemen is back on schedule with an $8.5 million appropriation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the statement should be printed in the RECORD. May we have a ruling that the Senator's statement before the Appropriations Committee in 1960 may be printed in the RECORD at this point?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN A. CARROLL BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY, 1960, IN BEHALF OF FUNDS FOR RANGE RESEEDING AND SOIL AND MOISTURE CONSERVATION PRACTICES BY THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Colorado ranchers are concerned about the budget estimate reduction of $481,400 in the soil and moisture conservation program of the Bureau of Land Management.

The House of Representatives has now concurred in that reduction.

If the Senate concurs in that action we will have thrown the 1955 20-year plan of the Bureau of Land Management 40 percent behind schedule.

In fiscal 1960 the soil and moisture conservation program had an appropriation of $3,733,900. This was down about $100,000 from the previous year. It has now been cut by $481,000 which reduces it to $3,252,000.

Under the BLM plan established in 1955 it was proposed that soil and moisture work should progress on the following appropriation schedule in order to accomplish the range protection work so vital to the economy of our Western States:

1956	$2,800,000
1957	3,500,000
1958	4,200,000
1959	4,900,000
1960	5,600,000
Total	21,000,000

Instead the amounts appropriated have been:

1956	$2,738,971
1957	3,186,142
1958	3,625,060
1959	3,815,050
1960	3,733,900
Total	17,099,123

In fiscal 1961 it was anticipated under the BLM 20-year soil and moisture conservation plan to expend $6,300,000. Instead the budget estimate calls for $3,252,500.

We fall further behind in our goal each year.

The difference in the budget estimate and the BLM 20-year plan means the following in soil and water conservation work on the Federal lands of the semiarid West:

1. Instead of building 80 detention dams we will build 42.
2. Instead of seeding 150,000 acres of western range land to grass we will seed 76,300.
3. Instead of controlling brush on 120,000 acres we will attack only 59,100 acres.
4. Instead of caring for 2,600,000 acres of land we will be able to care for only 1,403,000 acres.

All of this, as you can see, is a drastic reduction in the program the Bureau of Land Management and its State advisers deemed necessary for the next 20 years in the West.

I know the committee understands and appreciates the value of soil and moisture work in the West.

I am hopeful the committee will see fit to move this BLM program at least partially back on the schedule set for it in 1955.

I recommend that the committee consider restoring the $481,400 reduction in the Bureau of Land Management soil and moisture conservation appropriation and adding $518,600 to help bring the program back on schedule, making a total appropriation of $4,252,000.

Mr. CARROLL. I do this for the purpose of emphasizing the continuing importance of the problem to Colorado. Colorado ranchers, ably represented by Dan Hughes and Leonard Horn, have worked for years to get progressive soil and moisture and land management programs in our States. I am very reluctant even to raise a question that might in any way affect the possibility of adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. The amendment ought to be accepted overwhelmingly.

I point out, as the Senator from Oregon pointed out, that the Bureau of Land Management would retain the sole authority. The Bureau would use its best judgment and best intelligence as to how to begin the program.

This is to be the beginning of a great program. As Secretary Carver said to me today, "This is history in the making in the field of conservation." I know how hard the Senator from Oregon has worked for the program. I am told that the Vale project is a breakthrough into a new range-conservation concept. The intent now will be to take range areas on a project-by-project basis, much like Bueau of Reclamation water projects.

I say to the Bureau of Land Management and to those who will make the decisions on new projects: Take a look at western Colorado. We have several range districts ready to be rehabilitated and restored. Our Colorado stockmen need this help.

In view of the statements which have been made I hope Colorado will receive early consideration.

I thank the Senator from Oregon. I support his amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I wish to discuss with members of the commit-

tee some language in the report, on page 17, as follows:

The Senate concurs with the House allowance of $7 million for the migratory bird conservation account. The purpose of this appropriation is acceleration of acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat as authorized by the act of October 4, 1961.

That act was Public Law 87–383. It provided that there would be loaned to the migratory bird conservation program $105 million. In accordance with that loan, $7 million was proposed to be spent the first fiscal year, $20 million for the four succeeding fiscal years, and $18 million in the last year. In order to establish the program and activate the staffing so that the Commission on Acceleration could work, the appropriation was included. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and I are the representatives in the Senate on the Commission. Of course, we want to do everything that we can in order to carry out the will of the Senate. Therefore, I direct these remarks to the question of determining exactly what should be done.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that Public Law 87–383, an act of October 4, 1961, provides that—

No land shall be acquired with moneys from the Migratory Bird Conservation Fund unless the acquisition thereof has been approved by the Governor of the State or an appropriate State agency.

Members of the Commission have gone much further than that. The Commission has been very careful not only to see that the Governor of the State accepted and acquiesced in the proposed acquisition of land, but when opposition has arisen from local boards of county commissioners, county judges, or local taxpayers' associations, the Commission has rejected the proposed acquisition. Since there are so many areas in which we can work, we have desisted from going against local authority.

So when the committee directs that no staffs be formed to carry out the program until such time as the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota have assented to purchase of the lands in those States as required by law, I find some ambiguity in the direction the Senate has given me as its representative on the Commission. Does the language mean, for example, that we cannot go into the State of Louisiana or the State of California under the accelerated program, or must we stay out of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota until the authorities have acquiesced in the program?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. First of all, I agree with the Senator from Montana that there is some ambiguity in the language as it appears at the top of page 17. It is subject to varying interpretations by different people. I shall try to relate precisely what the committee had in mind.

The provision is at best a temporary safeguard which has been put in by the committee because of proposed legislation of which the Senator from Montana may be coauthor. though I am not sure. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] and I are members is now working through a subcommittee to develop legislative language to meet that kind of problem.

I think perhaps the language might be stated in the following way, and I wonder if it would mcet the objection of the Senator from Montana. What we were really endeavoring to say is that—

The committee directs that no staff be formed to carry out the purchase program in the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota until those States have assented to purchase of lands as required by law.

The phrases were placed in rather difficult and redundant context. The statement is subject to some misinterpretation, but what I have stated is what we are trying to do. Would that language be satisfactory to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. METCALF. Whatever the Senate directs me to do as its representative on the Commission is satisfactory. I only wanted to be sure what the Senate specifically meant. Of course, the language would help us under the accelerated program to acquire additional wet lands. There are magnificent wetlands available.

Mr. MUNDT. The tax problem in other States is not as serious as it is in the three States mentioned. As the Senator knows, concentration purchases are contemplated in those three States. In turn, those purchases are concentrated in a few of the counties of each State; and until some way is found to reimburse those counties, we might conceivably bankrupt certain counties in certain States. The Senator would not want to do that, and neither would the committee.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am sure that in any event the members of the Commission would not want to do that. We would wait until the Governor and the local county agents acquiesced in the proposed purchases. But there are other magnificent wet lands that we can acquire, especially in the southern range. In those areas there are not the wonderful breeding grounds which are available in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota, but the winter ranges might be chosen so that we could get the program underway.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARTLETT. The language of the Senator from South Dakota would permit us to do that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the whole legislative history of the wetlands bill is that we would not proceed in any case until we had the complete agreement of the local authorities, whether it be State, county, or other local authority.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. Our language comports with that lcgislative history.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator from South Dakota has clarified the question and removed any doubt which the Senator from Montana has had. But I should like to direct the same question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the section referred to is written in such a manner that until agreement has been reached with all three States, none of the $7 million recommended for the migratory bird conservation account can be used to hire personnel to carry out the provisions of Public Law 87–383. This does not affect any funds which otherwise may be available.

I understand that Minnesota has now agreed to all acquisition of lands in the State proposed to date. North and South Dakota are withholding their assent until legislation is enacted to provide a greater payment to the States in lieu of taxes lost because the purchased lands are taken from the tax rolls.

I personally would be willing to say that the funds are available for staffing necessary to carry out the law in a State which has agreed to the land acquisition requirements; and to purchase land easements to which each of these States has indicated there will be no objection.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the chairman of the committee. That is a complete answer to the question that the Senator from Montana had in carrying out his duties as a member of the Commission.

I also thank the Senator from South Dakota for his explanation and clarification.

(At this point Mrs. NEUBERGER took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, it is never a pleasant task to have to reject the request of a Senator's colleague for funds for the districts which they represent. It is always easier and more pleasant to say, "The Secretary of the Treasury does not have the money, but we will borrow it and make it available to you."

Naturally I should like to participate in that sociable activity. But I think the decision which the Senate made in a yea-and-nay vote a few minutes ago in protecting the position of the committee as against a request for $129,800 increase for a specific purpose, set a precedent that should be followed now when we are asked to make a $2 million increase for a different purpose. We voted to economize then—let us vote to economize now.

One can build arguments for the laudability of either program. But if we are to have any semblance of fiscal responsibility, we cannot by votes of the Senate as a whole begin to dole out $2 million contributions to States or quartets of States that have local problems.

The request we are now considering has a strange resemblance to some of the discussions that I have heard at recent meetings of our Senate Permanent Committee on Investigations, which has been looking into favoritism and alleged irregularities in connection with the operations of a well known Texan. It is alleged that this prominent Texas citizen, among other things, used part of his ill-gotten gains to buy favors for himself from Government officials. In Congress we have given the name of "payola" to that kind of operation.

It seems to me that the request now before the Senate has a great deal of similarity to what might be called payola in reverse.

This time it looks as though a Government agency is trying to buy off Congress. This, I submit, is the goal of the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Land Management in their request for $2 million for a program of range development in the Western States.

The proposed amendment had a curious record of evolvement as it came before our committee. I propose to recite that rather strange and unusual record. I do not know whether it is intended primarily as an effort to increase the pasturage in the Western States, where I certainly believe there is need for additional conservation, or whether the measure is intended to add a little more attractiveness to the political pasturage on which the donkeys of that area are expected to feed next November. In either case we are dealing with green pasturage, whether it is green pasturage for animals or green currency for politicians. It seems to me this record on how this amendment developed should be before the Senate before it votes.

As I said earlier, as the ranking Republican member of the committee, I feel that the Senate ought at least on a rollcall vote to express itself on all of these requests for increases. As one Senator, all I can do is to continue to say that I think the Senate would do well to support the Committee on Appropriations instead of plunging off into the great blue yonder on new Federal spending sprees at a time when the President is preparing to ask us, for the second time in 1962, to increase the debt limit.

This is one place at least where we do not have to spend $2 million in the current fiscal year unless the Senate so elects.

I suggest now to recite the record by which we come to the decision we are about to make:

First, it will not be challenged by anyone that no hearing was held on the request; that no one appeared before the committee except the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who did make his presentation on it. Other than that we have not had one word of testimony on the request and no opportunity to ask one question of any responsible department official as to what this would involve. All we have is the fact that the Senator from Oregon appeared before the Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee on March 13, which, I submit, was an unlucky day, when he asked for an additional appropriation of $2 million, "to be expended in areas where the range surveys indicated a need to reduce permitted grazing use or where wildlife demands cannot be met at the existing level of range condition."

It was not until over a month later, on April 19, that Senate Document No. 88 arrived, and we found that the request was that the money was to be spent in Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. It was never the intention that all the money was to be spent in Oregon at that time. That was never the recommendation of the Advisory Council. It was always contemplated that the $2 million would be spent on projects as the Department of the Interior recommended.

Mr. MUNDT. What the Senator says emphasizes what I am trying to get across to the Senate, that if that is true—and I presume it is if the Senator says so—the Appropriations Committee was without any chance to hear such testimony.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. That is the difficulty that we have when we try to legislate on matters without a single word of testimony on them.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator have before him a copy of Senate Document No. 88, which is the request of the Budget Bureau for the $2 million?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not have it here at the moment. Does the Senator have it?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish the Senator would read it, to show whether all this money was intended to be spent in Oregon.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I read Senate Document No. 88:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 19, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 involving an increase in the amount of $2 million for the Department of the Interior.

The details of this amendment, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for its submission at this time are set forth in the enclosed letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 involving an increase in the amount of $2 million for the Department of the Interior, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

Budget appendix page	Heading	Original estimate	Revised estimate	Increase
457	Management of lands and resources	$41,552,000	$43,252,000	$1,700,000
458	Construction	1,000,000	1,300,000	300,000

This amendment to the budget is to provide facilities and services for the initiation of a pilot project to demonstrate the benefits which can be derived from increasing the productivity of depleted rangelands, and to accelerate improvements on other lands. The estimate is submitted at this time to carry forward recently completed plans for the intensive rehabilitation of the Yale grazing district in southeastern Oregon.

I recommend that the foregoing amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

DAVID S. BELL,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MUNDT. By whom is that letter signed?

Mr. DWORSHAK. By David S. Bell, Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the Senator's refreshing my memory on this matter, because I now have the Bureau of the Budget's letter, which the Senator has read. It simply goes to show how confusing the situation was, and that even the Senator from Oregon was confused. He did not realize he was getting $2 million for Oregon alone, because he just told the Senate it was not going to go to Oregon. Here we have the testimony from David S. Bell, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I thought I remembered it, but I was not going to set my memory against the statement of presumed fact. As the Senator from Idaho has pointed out, the Department states specifically that the $2 million was to go to Oregon at the time we received Senate Document 88, and at the time the committee first voted to reject the proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon has never been confused about it. The Appropriations Committee had the report of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, before it, which sets forth in detail the recommendation for the expenditure at the Vale District, at the Boise District, in Nevada, and in New Mexico. There was attached to it a tabulation of the funds that were required.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator quoting from the presentation to our committee on May 18, or to our committee by the Department of the Interior?

Mr. MORSE. May 18.

Mr. MUNDT. I am quoting from Senate Document No. 88 dated April 19, 1962, which also contains a letter dated April 17, written by David Bell, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I ask unanimous consent that the entire document of April 17 appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1962.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 involving an increase in the amount of $2 million for the Department of the Interior, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Land Management

Budget appendix page	Heading	Original estimate	Revised estimate	Increase
457	Management of lands and resources	$41,552,000	$43,252,000	$1,700,000
458	Construction	1,000,000	1,300,000	300,000

This amendment to the budget is to provide facilities and services for the initiation of a pilot project to demonstrate the benefits which can be derived from increasing the productivity of depleted rangelands, and to accelerate improvements on other lands. The estimate is submitted at this time to carry forward recently completed plans for the intensive rehabilitation of the Vale grazing district in southeastern Oregon.

I recommend that the foregoing amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

DAVID S. BELL,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MORSE. I have already put it in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT. It is now in the RECORD again. The Senator is saying I am quoting in error. There it is in toto.

Mr. MORSE. I did not say it was in error. It is 30 days before the other document.

I have given the whole history. I have set forth what the Advisory Council agreed on here in Washington. It was their program. It was the program that the President asked for when he requested $2 million to carry it out. It covered the projects that I have listed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to point out that there has been nothing said that changes by one iota the record as it evolved before the committee. First we were presented with the request for $2 million which, the Bureau of the Budget said on that day, was to be spent in Oregon in toto. At that point the Senator rose and said that was not the fact. I said if it is not the fact, then my memory is wrong. It was refreshed, happily, by the document read by the Senator from Idaho. Up to this time the record stands unchallenged. I wish to point out the rest of the evidence as it unfolded before our committee in due course.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. While we are clearing up various statements in connection with this project, I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New Mexico an article which disturbed me somewhat. It was published in Newsweek magazine of May 28, 1962. I have no idea as to the accuracy of this article, but I would appreciate hearing both Senators comment on it. I read from Newsweek of May 28, 1962, as follows:

THE PERISCOPE

WHITE HOUSE.—Two examples of the close-in support J.F.K. is giving to Democratic Senators up for reelection: (1) When Oregon's Senator WAYNE MORSE asked Congress for $2 million to set up a cattle-range project in his home State, J.F.K. telephoned him to promise his personal endorsement; and (2) the President has privately informed Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, that he'll not push for action this summer on a bill opposed by CHURCH and his constituents—repeal of the Silver Purchase Act.

I believe that the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from South Dakota will agree with me that the approval or disapproval of the $2 million request should be based on its merits and not upon how it would affect the reelection of a Member of the Senate. An amendment should be considered only on its merits.

Mr. MUNDT. To a question of that kind, I should say that Newsweek is owned by the Washington Post; and the distinguished Senator for Oregon has a much closer relationship with the Washington Post than does the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MORSE. Since when, I ask the Senator from South Dakota, do I have a closer relationship with the Washington Post than he does?

Mr. MUNDT. My relations with the Washington Post are not very good.

Mr. MORSE. They are better than mine.

Since the Senator from Delaware has raised a question of politics in this case, I may say to him that I do not know of anyone who questions my word as being my bond. My fight for range rehabilitation goes back for years and years. I have battled for this kind of range rehabilitation over the years. I am proud of the success we have had in the program from time to time.

Strong protests developed in my State, in Idaho, and in some of the other Western States over a policy which the Bureau of Land Management under this administration was inaugurating. Hearings were held in Oregon, at which the Director of the Bureau of Land Management appeared. I, too, appeared, as did the Representative from eastern Oregon, and we listened to the ranchers. Out of the protest meetings came the meetings in Washington, attended by members of the National Advisory Council and the State Advisory Council, and this program was evolved under the Taylor Grazing Act.

The Senator from South Dakota refers to the notification from the Bureau of the Budget. I have never contested that. I placed it in the RECORD. The Bureau of the Budget did not understand the program which was being recommended by the Department of the Interior. So there followed the explanations of the program, which left no room for doubt that from the very beginning it was always contemplated that the program was for the West, not merely for Oregon. It is a range rehabilitation program for all the West, as I have explained earlier, and it will be started under the $2 million request.

The Senator from South Dakota need have no question about what my testimony was before the Committee on Appropriations. I do not wish to interrupt his remarks, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement I made on March 13, 1962, before the Committee on Appropriations. The statement will show that there is no question that the Senator from Oregon was urging this program not for Oregon alone, but for the West.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The budget presented by the Bureau of Land Management included an increase of approximately $8 million over last year. In my judgment, this is a minimum increase. I can report to this committee, however, that the forest program on the Oregon and California revested lands is proceeding with a high degree of efficiency. The increase provided will assure this forward momentum and I strongly urge the allowance of the funds requested. It is estimated that during the coming year revenues in access of $32 million will be realized from the sale of 1 billion board feet of timber from these lands. When this tremendous income is measured against the $4.1 million budget it is evident that even after taking into account payments made to the counties, the Federal Government is receiving a handsome return both on past investments and operating expenses.

Grazing

In 1959, when I appeared before this committee, I pointed out that the lack of adequate appropriations was developing an extremely harmful situation in the administration of grazing lands by the Bureau of Land Management in eastern Oregon. A comparison of the vast grazing holdings of the BLM with its forest holdings and the

budgets for each provide conclusive evidence that the funds for administration and management on grazing lands have long been substantially below minimum standards.

The Bureau has continued to make its range surveys and these often have resulted in proposals to substantially reduce permit grazing. Decisions such as these are working extreme hardship on range permittees, a number of whom are scheduled for cuts in use of 50, 60, and even 70 percent in their permits. The matter has received my personal attention and that of my colleague in the House, Congressman AL ULLMAN. We have met on the ground with the cattlemen, with conservationists, and with Government employees, including research specialists. Our eastern Oregon range has been largely converted to a cheatgrass range and this grass does not provide the type of dependable forage which both livestock and game require.

I have a request before the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee for a modest increase in research funds for the Agricultural Research Service. However, the extent of our knowledge today is such that it is not necessary to await the results of research before pushing ahead vigorously with improved management techniques. I recognize that the President's budget for this year provides for increase in range administration and soil and moisture conservation. The cooperation that I have received from this committee, and particularly Chairman HAYDEN, in my effort to bring about immediate rehabilitation of burned-over rangeland has resulted in the inclusion in the budget of provisions that will assure funds to meet these emergencies.

I propose that we now taken another forward step and it is in line with recommendations which I have made earlier and which have been adopted in part through the actions of this committee. The Bureau of Land Management desperately needs a more adequate appropriation for soil and moisture work and range administration.

The Bureau should be in a position where it can place into effect range rehabilitation programs and in the process hold to a minimum the reduction of permitted grazing use. To put it another way, the budget for the Bureau of Land Management in this activity, should be geared toward realizing in the next 10 years the capability of these lands to carry double the present quantity of livestock and to meet fully our requirements for game management. Therefore, I request that an additional appropriation of $2 million be made to be expended in areas where range surveys indicate a need to reduce permitted grazing use or where wildlife demands cannot be met at the existing level of range condition. These funds would be used for reseeding, the conversion of cheatgrass range to crested grass, the elimination of sage, fencing, and water development and more adequate cooperative management to assure proper utilization of the range. One example of the type of situation needing attention is the conflict between the use of bitterbrush by livestock and deer on deer winter ranges. For example, one study has shown that deer have overused certain areas. Research shows that the application of sound game and livestock management practices coupled with real improvements in the condition of the land can bring about a resolution of these problems.

I have had further conversations with Secretary Udall and Assistant Secretary Carver on ways and means to improve not only land management but cooperation between various groups.

As the members of this committee know, range conditions are not the same in every part of the Nation. One study showed that removing cows from a range in the Southeastern United States measurably increased the capacity of the land to grow beneficial grasses. Another study in Utah and the studies at Squaw Butte in Oregon show that removing the cows does not result in the range coming back. In still another study it has been shown that on certain western ranges the presence of rabbitbrush actually increases the production of crested wheat grass. This is contrary to one of the long-held views that brush reduces grass production. Rabbitbrush has a toprot that can drive down for water but it has poorly developed lateral roots. The crested wheat thus has no competition from rabbitbrush and thrives under and adjacent to rabbitbrush. On the other hand, big sagebrush measurably reduces the effectiveness of crested wheat grass and drives it out. In still another study it has been shown that rodents can be a primary cause of plant cover deterioration. Where livestock only had been excluded there were no marked changes in vegetative cover after 20 years but where rodents had been excluded there were marked changes in plant cover.

Therefore when I contend that cuts in range use will not always improve the range I am following the judgment of dedicated and trained researchers. The range manager must recognize the total biotic relationship. No range manager would expect to keep deer off the range with a 2-foot fence. Why should he try to restore the range for livestock and game by taking a step that just doesn't bring about the restoration?

I would like to have included with my remarks a copy of a letter I just received from an Oregon rancher, Mr. Merle Cummings. I think this letter is typical of the constructive approach that the majority of the ranchers in my State have exhibited. As Mr. Cummings points out, many of the ranchers accept the cuts simply because they believed there was no use in appealing the decision. Mr. Cummings goes on to say, "To me this is a dangerous attitude and if permitted to continue could threaten the very democratic foundations of our free system of government.

Whenever I find that a citizen has reached the point where he thinks that it is no use to appeal a decision even though he thinks he is right, then I feel it is time for the Congress to take notice. We are protecting the basic foundation of our system of government when we show a citizen that he can get a full and fair hearing. My goals in the review I have made of the problems of our ranchers have included attention to this very vital consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I ask each of you to read this letter from Mr. Cummings. I am sure that you will then agree with the case I have made for additional range funds.

The provision of additional funds will be helpful and I have the assurance that the Secretary of the Interior intends to proceed vigorously to achieve better cooperation and constructive improvement. I ask this committee to help on this matter as it has so capably in the past.

WESTFALL, OREG.,
March 5, 1962.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am writing to thank you for the copy of that part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your statement presented on the floor of the Senate in regard to your policy in the controversy between the users of public lands for grazing purposes and the BLM and the Izaak Walton League.

It is very heartening to the ranchers to get the support of their Senator and realize after many years of abuse both publicly and privately by the BLM and certain uninformed and misinformd private sporting groups to say nothing of the general public, to finally get some unbiased support from someone genuinely interested in our problems.

When we were informed by the BLM of these large cuts in the early spring of 1961 it was as if someone had cut the very ground out from under us as far as our livelihood was concerned with very little if any chance to get an unbiased hearing on our case. In the minds of many segments of the general public we were already judged as guilty in the destruction of the public ranges and prior hearings on appeals of range adjudications had been unsatisfactory as well as expensive to the permitees.

A number of permittees had accepted the terms of the BLM, not because they believed that they were right, but simply because they believed that there was no use appealing the decisions. To me this is a dangerous attitude and if permitted to continue could threaten the very democratic foundations of our free system of government.

I believe you have done a great service to our citizens in getting this matter out before the general public where the facts can be appraised for their true values rather than through misleading propaganda. After talking to some of my neighbors I am convinced that their faith in our Government has been renewed.

Certainly I do not write this to imply that there has not been abuses in some cases or that there is not room for improvement on our public rangelands. I believe in conservation and the majority of the livestock industry believe in conservation and restoration where possible and by all methods consistent with good range management.

In closing I would like to convey to you our heartfelt thanks for the opportunity to get our case out before the public in an honest and dignified manner. We believe in the future of our industry and that in most and perhaps all instances the future of the public ranges can be maintained and improved where improvement is possible without crippling reductions in carrying capacity.

Sincerely,

J. MERLE CUMMINGS,
President, Westfall Range Users Association.

Mr. MUNDT. I suppose the statement appears in the hearings, but I have no objection to its appearing again in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator has apparently become involved in a dispute over the correct date. I call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the fact that our subcommittee marked up the bill on May 10. I believe that is a correct statement. That was when this item was rejected or was discussed. I have before me a letter signed by Assistant Secretary of the Interior John A. Carver, Jr., dated May 14, 1962, after the rejection of the proposal by our subcommittee. The letter is addressed to the senior Senator from Oregon and reads:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In accordance with your request there is enclosed a program for rehabilitation of range lands in the Western States.

The enclosed material outlines a range improvement program along the lines presented in your testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations.

A statement submitted by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior bears the following heading:

Bureau of Land Management, Additional Data Regarding Budget Amendment, 1963, for Accelerated Range Rehabilitation on the Public Lands.

It seems obvious that 4 days after our subcommittee had acted upon this appropriation, Acting Secretary of the Interior Carver complied with the request for additional data—at least, the heading contains the words "Additional Data"—and then submitted a statement, from which I quote as follows:

The only alternative to permanent reductions in grazing use and continued flood and sediment damages downstream is the restoration of these lands to full productivity. The Vale District in Oregon, the Boise District in Idaho, the Winnemucca District in Nevada, and the Rio Puerco drainage in the Albuquerque District in New Mexico symbolize many of the major problems in present-day Federal land resource management.

Obviously, no reference was made to any other district than the Vale, Oreg., District during the testimony and deliberations and until the markup of the bill; but 4 days after the bill had been marked up, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Carver submitted additional data.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from Idaho is correct. I expect to demonstrate that as I discuss the strange, unusual, and almost unprecedented evolvement of the amendment before our committee. At least, the fact now stands unchallenged in the RECORD that there were no hearings of any kind before the committee. We were asked to buy a cat in the bag. What is now being discussed in the colloquy must be very confusing to Senators who are not on the committee, because it is slightly confusing to us who are.

At least, the first point stands; namely, that there were no hearings.

Second, on March 13, the senior Senator from Oregon made a presentation to our committee. No one denies that. The purport is subject to different interpretations; but at least the presentation was made.

No one can deny that the Bureau of the Budget, in commenting upon that statement, said that the $2 million would be spent in Oregon. So we have the third point established. I shall endeavor to establish a few more, some of which might be enlightening to the Senators from Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah, who think their States will receive benefits. However, I think the Senators from Colorado, Wyoming, and Utah ought to know before they vote for the proposal that a legislative history cannot be established on an appropriation bill by colloquies with Senators who are not members of the Committee on Appropriations. I think that is also established.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have some acquaintance with this subject. As I understand the situation, and I have examined the statement which the Senator from Oregon placed before the committee on page 1203 of the hearings, I do not interpret his statement to be a statement in behalf of districts other than the Vale, Oreg., district and the other districts which are named.

This proposal was not placed before the Bureau of the Budget last year; or if it was, the Bureau of the Budget rejected it.

The Senator from Oregon came before the Subcommittee on Appropriations on March 13, 1962. The first document of the Bureau of the Budget was dated April 19.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. That is the one which confirms that all the money will be spent in Oregon.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is the first one. That is the one to which the Senator from Oregon refers.

Then the bill was marked up on May 10 and was reported to the Senate on the same day or the next day by the full committee. The full committee did not accept this item.

On May 18, 1962, the Department of the Interior presented its document, or letter, with respect to the other proposals.

I should like to say, as I said before the Committee on Appropriations, that there is no State which has a greater interest in grazing districts than does my own State of Colorado. If it is proposed to have the Bureau of Land Management engage in a broad national program, as the Senator from Oregon has indicated, then I think it ought to be on a planned basis, not on a basis of some proposal which has been dug up after the fact, to justify the statements of the Senator from Oregon and to beef up his case and put it in another context. If the Government is to engage in such a proposition as this, then we in Colorado have every right to demand that we be included in the presentation of facts along with the States which are named in the document of May 18.

If we are to engage in such a program, certainly Colorado has every right to demand inclusion in the participation set forth in the document of May 18, which includes New Mexico and other States.

Mr. MUNDT. We endeavored to dissuade the Senator from Oregon—who is somewhat difficult to dissuade, at times—from offering the amendment, because shortly there will be before our committee a supplemental appropriation bill. Furthermore, in the discussion of his proposal, there was considerable support among the members of the Appropriations Committee for launching an attack against the impoverishment of the grazing land and the pasturage of the Western States. But we happen to believe that Senators who do not live in those particular States are also entitled to some consideration for their States. So we would be happy to have hearings held and to proceed on this program, once we get the evidence from the technicians, aside from the political interests involved. I feel certain that if that is done, Colorado, Utah, and California will be included, instead of excluded; and many other States which have the identical problem will also be included in whatever action the committee finally takes, after it has all the evidence before it.

But if a start is made on a program which includes only 4 States, before the other States have an opportunity to be included, we shall find that cattle will be grazing in dust ponds in many of the States before this project—whether experimental or utilitarian—can possibly be completed.

So, because of the paucity of information—not because of any lack of recognition of the existence of the problem—we said that we thought it best first to get the evidence from the technicians and to establish the legislative history; and the only place where that can be done is in the committee. So we propose to have that evidence taken before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I wish to emphasize exactly the point the Senator from South Dakota has just made. For a considerable number of years a good deal of the time in my office has been taken up each year in efforts to solve the various problems to which the Senator from South Dakota has referred.

In the Appropriations Committee it was pointed out that the statement of the Bureau of Land Management representative in Oregon did not justify the request for Vale Valley.

My colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], is now in the Chamber. I point out that I do not think this proposal has been properly documented or justified. Are we now to offer an amendment to include Colorado, also? I do not think so, because I do not think this proposal has been properly documented, or that there have been proper hearings or proper evaluations of it. I do not know what course my colleague will take, but I know that I will not offer an amendment to include Colorado; I shall simply urge all Senators to vote against the amendment, because we are soon to have before us a supplemental appropriation bill; and if the proposal is as important as Senators have said it is, undoubtedly we shall be able to provide for a long-term grazing project for all the Western States.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, as a member of the committee which will consider the supplemental requests, I shall be most happy—and I am assured by the chairman of the committee that he will be, too, to hear all such matters presented. But we see no reason in the world to "buy a cat in a bag" now, without any member of the committee having an opportunity to ask questions or even to discuss the needs in the other States, except as letters have come from the other States, whose residents are having the same problem. But there has been no opportunity to take testimony before the committee.

It seems to me that Senators who wish to have an opportunity to have $2 million poured into their States at this time should be willing to have the committee hold hearings and to let other States have their day in court, so that the entire picture can be understood, rather than to start with a statement by the

Bureau of Budget that all the money will go to Oregon, and then gradually watch the picture unfold and shift and change as efforts are made to induce the committee to go along with the proposal.

To the Senators from Colorado and to the Senators from other States who think their States will get a great deal of money out of this program, I can say that only these four States are included at this time, and the Senators from these four States have divided the money among their own States, in advance of the fact.

As the matter now stands, Oregon is to get only half of the $2 million, instead of the entire $2 million, as was the original idea of the Senator from Oregon; Idaho will get $200,000; Winnemucca—which I suspect is in another of the four States—will get $250,000; and Albuquerque, N. Mex., will get $425,000.

I assume that Winnemucca is in one of the four States; and I can tell, by looking at the sponsorship of the amendment, where Winnemucca is located. It must be in Nevada.

I think the inclusion of all these may be very meritorious, and I can see myself voting for the inclusion of all of them if their inclusion can be justified on the basis of the testimony to be given by the departmental technicians and the other experts. But we are simply asked to vote for this "buggy-ride" of $2 million, with not one nickel to go to Colorado. Under this proposal, it is impossible to find that even one thin dime will go to any State except the States of the four sponsors of the amendment. So that is the legislative history of the amendment, and that is the fait accompli.

I believe that Colorado has this problem, too, for I have seen letters which so state. Likewise I believe there is such a problem in Utah. I believe the problem is rather general in the Western States. I believe something should be done about the problem at this session of Congress, but certainly it should be done in an orderly manner.

Oh, how the Senator from Oregon loves orderly procedure. That is very fine; and now I give him an opportunity to demonstrate whether there is to be orderly procedure before the committee in connection with this program.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the Senator from South Dakota has built up an interesting strawman, but it is only a strawman, for there never was a proposal to confine this item to Oregon. The council proceeded to point out that the Bureau of the Budget misunderstood the project.

I have stated how the project was brought into being. Colorado, California, and the other States are not excluded. They are included.

Mr. MUNDT. They will get everything but the money.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no. But these particular projects are now ready to go ahead. The others are to be included in the 7-year program.

The program was filed with the committee by the Department of the Interior; and the committee had the information.

The Senator from Colorado says that someone in the Bureau of Land Management in Oregon says the Vale project is not ready. If anyone in the Bureau of Land Management in the State of Oregon ever made such a statement, he made it contrary to the recommendation of the head of the Bureau and contrary to the recommendation of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior and contrary to the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior himself.

There has been much talk about what the full committee did. I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota will tell the Senate how many members of the committee attended the full committee meeting when the bill was marked up, and how many of the members of the committee who voted were Republicans and how many of them were Democrats. I understand that on that particular day the overwhelming majority of those present were Republicans, that only a few Democrats were present, and that no proxies were used. I further understand that the Democrats voted for the project and the Republicans voted against it.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, apparently the Senator from Oregon is trying to identify his amendment as purely a Democratic amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to say——

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. MORSE. Then later I shall take the floor in my own right.

Mr. MUNDT. All I can say is that I have no idea who was there, how many were there, whether they were Democrats or Republicans, because I cannot remember a single time when we have sat in that committee and have voted as Democrats or Republicans. I think it is incorrect to say that, being an amendment offered by a Democrat, it would have been adopted had a majority of Democrats been present. I do not know whether such a partisan majority was present. I think it would be looked at as the Chairman and the rest of the members have looked at such proposals. It was a matter which was not presented in an orderly fashion. No hearings were held on it. Even the sponsors of the proposal become increasingly confused as to what it is about as they discuss it on the floor of the Senate.

Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

HUNGER IN THE COMMUNIST WORLD

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to read an editorial which was carried in the Cleveland Press of June 4, 1962. I ask that the editorial be included in the RECORD either preceding or following the discussion that has been had on the topic that has been before the Senate for the last 30 or 40 minutes.

The editorial is entitled "Hunger in the Communist World," and reads as follows:

It is no mere coincidence that food shortages in China are accompanied by steep increases in Russian food prices. The trouble is chronic. It is basic to the Communist system and it is getting progressively worse.

This is true wherever the Red flag flies, even in satellite nations which once had food to export. Mass socialistic experiments have combined with natural disasters in China to cause historic famine affecting nobody knows how many millions. After 44 years of these experiments the Russians tacitly have admitted failure, though they haven't moved to change the system. To do so would be to confess to the world that communism is the tragic fraud it is.

The latest evidence is in the Russian price increases just announced. Butter, which had been priced at $1.45 a pound, has gone up to $1.80. Ham has been increased from $1.45 to $1.85. Other meat prices are up in proportion.

In an earlier Russian famine we sent vast quantities of food and other relief which was administered by Herbert Hoover. This saved many lives but it also helped prop up a shaky regime and it is a question, over the long haul, whether it reduced the total amount of Russian misery, materially, or at all.

Humanitarian instinct urges we find a way to get food into Red China, though the belligerent nature of that government makes that practically impossible and even our vast surpluses would not go far among China's 650 millions.

And even if such relief were possible, it would help this brutal regime through this crisis, preserving it to exploit and starve more generations of Chinese, perhaps fashioning them into a military machine which, as in the case of Russia, threatens our own peace and security.

We should feed and help resettle these Chinese refugees wherever they can get out; but aid through the gangster lords of this stricken land is against our own obvious interest. In the long run it also is against the interest of the Chinese people.

The food crisis in Russia is acute. It is acute in every Communist country. It is causing Chinese to flee in hordes whenever they can to places of refuge, where they hope to obtain food. The absence of food in every Communist nation is today a critical problem for those governments to solve.

Though humanitarian instincts prompt the giving of aid to those countries, when we give them aid we are allowing them to put more money into guns and ammunition and less into food. When we give them aid in solving their problems, we relieve them of the responsibility of growing food and we help them in their purpose of producing guns, possibly to be used against our American youth.

That applies to China and to every Communist nation which cannot produce the necessary food and is asking us to help supply it food while it is putting money into guns, ammunition, and other equipment contemplated for war.

Mr. MUNDT and Mr. CARROLL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a comment on the remarks of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognized the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I should like to know how I lost the floor, having yielded with the understanding that I would not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, I have no objection to the Senator from South Dakota holding the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from New York, with the same understanding.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, the general principle to which the distinguished Senator from Ohio has called attention, although it may not meet this precise situation, will be greatly assisted by adoption of the amendment I offered to the foreign aid bill, which would deny, as the sense of Congress, aid to a country which, as a report of U.S. aid was able to divert an equivalent amount to buy Communist arms.

This is not exactly the same point, because of course we do not aid Red China, but the principle is very similar. Food is a weapon also, and we must never forget it.

I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Ohio has called attention to the problem because I feel it is a matter to which we do not generally give sufficient attention.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield for another brief comment on this subject?

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I should like to get on with the work of the Appropriations Committee. I have yielded for these extraneous discussions in the hope that they would be brief. I do not wish to shut off any Senator, but I am sure the Senate would like to finish consideration of the appropriation bill today. I am prepared to conclude my own remarks shortly. I understand the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] wishes to speak.

With that little admonition, I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This will take only a half minute.

Mr. MUNDT. Very well.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One of the newspapers carried a very interesting cartoon, which showed a field with all the attributes for growing corn, but instead of growing corn it was growing guns. The cartoon depicted what is happening in the Communist nations.

Mr. MUNDT. I vividly recall the cartoon.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, so that the RECORD may be complete, no matter what action the Senate finally decides to take in this connection, and so that it will be available for the review of friends at home, for other Members of the Senate and of the House, and for representatives of the press who may be interested in what occurs in the Congress—I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks certain appropriate items.

First, I ask unanimous consent to have printed parts of the presentation by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to the Appropriations Subcommittee.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Access road

On February 26 of this year several of us from the Northwest asked the Chief of the Forest Service whether additional funds could be utilized for the program entitled, "Access Roads." You will recall that this road acquisition program was initiated by a number of us led by your colleague on this committee, the senior Senator from Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON. Earlier Senator NEUBERGER transmitted to you the identical response we all received from Dr. McArdle. He pointed out that an additional $4 million could be expended wisely and that this would result in the marketing of 300 million board feet of forest timber and the realization in 1 year alone of $5 million in revenues. When it is recognized that this income will continue in perpetuity, the appropriation of this additional $4 million becomes an expenditure we cannot afford to overlook. With regard to this program I would like to emphasize that it really has just one purpose—to assure the orderly harvest of national forest timber by making timely arrangements to utilize roads already constructed through the national forest by private companies.

In the Douglas-fir region of Oregon and Washington there are almost 14 million acres of commercial forest land of which 7.8 million acres or 56 percent is in public ownership. There are 8 million acres of old growth timber and 65 percent of this timber is in public ownership. One Forest Service study shows that 3 billion board feet are lost annually in the region due to mortality in these old-growth stands. This loss equals 25 percent of the annual timber harvest in the region. It occurs because of a lack of an adequate road network. In an extension of this study the Forest Service found that it is both practical and profitable to construct needed roads well in advance of the final harvest of the timber. Interest, maintenance charges, and depreciation on capital investment can be met by returns obtained from timber salvage.

The situation which faces the Forest Service is a practical one. In many areas the demand for timber is great. In some areas there are private roads already serving the national forest timber. These should be made available. In some cases this will make it possible to increase the allowable cut. In other situations the allowable cut is already being obtained from another part of the working circle. Here the benefit will be to capture large losses due to mortality or to assure a better balance between summer and winter logging. Wise use of the forest resources requires that we place in the hands of the forest managers the flexibility to wisely crop the forest. This is what we seek.

Members of this committee may be aware that the Secretary of Agriculture on the advice of the Attorney General and at the direction of President Kennedy is in the process of making a careful and thorough review of Forest Service policies relating to access to the national forests. It is therefore essential during the pendency of this review that we continue to provide the Forest Service with the tested and proven means of offering some improvement in an extremely difficult situation. The $4 million we have requested will do this.

Recreation

I am pleased to note that the Forest Service budget for this year contains a substantial increase for recreation. It is my hope that the committee will also look at the extent to which the planned budget fulfills the requirements for the national forest program. Recreation is one of the fastest growing uses for the national forest. When Secretary Benson presented the program for the national forests to the Congress in 1959, he estimated that recreation visits would reach the level of 130 million annually by 1970. Since that time much new information has been developed, including that prompted by the Outdoor Recreation Commission. This enabled President Kennedy and Secretary Freeman to point out to us last year that recreation visits by 1972 would reach almost 200 million annually. Recreational uses on the national forests in 1961 exceeded 100 million visits. This is a 273-percent increase over 1950.

Recreation is an important industry in Oregon and our national forests are a key element in its growth but national forest recreational use in Oregon is not as great as in some other States. All I will say to this committee is that if the situation is as critical in other States as I know it to be in my own, we are going to find it necessary to revise our estimates of what needs to be done and to raise our sights considerably. At this point, I would like to include in the record the opening statement from the annual report of the supervisor of the Willamette National Forest, Mr. David Gibney:

"Everyone has an interest in the national forests.

"You may not earn your living in the forest, and you may not play there.

"You may never visit a national forest * * * but your interest in this land is as strong as anyone's, for the national forests belong to you and its multiple benefits are yours as surely as if you worked or played there.

"From the national forests comes lumber for many products—water for power, industry and human consumption—forage for raising cattle and sheep, for food and clothing. On the national forests, in some of the most beautiful country in the United States, millions of people each year hunt, fish, camp, hike, and enjoy themselves in the outdoors.

"The forest has many uses and each of these is vital to the welfare of the Nation."

It so happens that this forest is one of the most active in the entire United States. Last year the Willamette National Forest deposited over $12 million into the Treasury of the United States. Its 1,600,000 acres were operated at a cost of less than $3 million. This national forest is a great national asset.

I know that this committee is busy and also that it is aware of many intimate aspects of national forest administration. Therefore, I will not place before you the entire report by the forest supervisor. However, I should point out that on this forest in addition to a vast timber business, there are now close to 860,000 recreational visits—triple the amount in 1956. This forest is the third ranking forest in Oregon in recreational use. The Deschutes and Mount Hood have even heavier use.

One of the most pressing needs that exists on the Willamette Forest is the making of an adequate provision for the development of the great recreational potential in the Waldo Lake area, high in the crest of the Cascade Mountains. This area has been the subject of a great deal of careful deliberation by many people of my State with a genuine interest in sound multiple-use forest management. My estimate of the sentiment

of the people in my State is that they want a rational development which places heavy emphasis on promoting the highest degree of well-rounded recreational opportunity. I am convinced that the necessary investments in roads, campgrounds, boating, and similar facilities in a situation which permits ready access in part of the area and trail access in the balance will produce what we all desire. I might point out that there are a number of unique scenic and scientific spots within the high mountain areas which demand most careful land-use planning for their protection.

The entire question of how to proceed is being actively studied by the Secretary of Agriculture, and he has placed this responsibility in the hands of his capable assistant, Dr. George Selke. I hope that the budget will permit moving ahead early next year following the completion of the analyses now underway.

The Willamette National Forest is an excellent example of a forest which offers a major challenge to the successful application of the principles of multiple use. It is one of the most ideally suited for recreation and it is one of the highest priority forests for the application of the most modern techniques in timber management.

The waters which are stored in this national forest are of an inestimable value to all of Oregon and it is the site of a number of major water utilization projects.

I am advised that to place the national forest program on schedule for recreation development in Oregon alone would require the appropriation of an additional $361,000. The national total would be somewhat higher. There are additional funds needed for recreation roads in the amount of $250,000. One of the major needs in recreation right now is to provide the full scheduled amount for the 1963 level of the national forest program for recreation, and I hope that the committee will see fit to do this.

* * * * *

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

The budget presented by the Bureau of Land Management included an increase of approximately $8 million over last year. In my judgment, this is a minimum increase. I can report to this committee, however, that the forest program on the Oregon and California revested lands is proceeding with a high degree of efficiency. The increase provided will assure this forward momentum and I strongly urge the allowance of the funds requested. It is estimated that during the coming year revenues in access of $32 million will be realized from the sale of 1 billion board feet of timber from these lands. When this tremendous income is measured against the $4.1 million budget it is evident that even after taking into account payments made to the counties, the Federal Government is receiving a handsome return both on past investments and operating expenses.

Grazing

In 1959, when I appeared before this committee, I pointed out that the lack of adequate appropriations was developing an extremely harmful situation in the administration of grazing lands by the Bureau of Land Management in eastern Oregon. A comparison of the vast grazing holdings of the BLM with its forest holdings and the budgets for each provide conclusive evidence that the funds for administration and management on grazing lands have long been substantially below minimum standards.

The Bureau has continued to make its range surveys and these often have resulted in proposals to substantially reduce permit grazing. Decisions such as these are working extreme hardship on range permittees, a number of whom are scheduled for cuts in use of 50, 60, and even 70 percent in their permits. The matter has received my personal attention and that of my colleague in the House, Congressman AL ULLMAN. We have met on the ground with the cattlemen, with conservationists, and with Government employees, including research specialists. Our eastern Oregon range has been largely converted to a cheatgrass range and this grass does not provide the type of dependable forage which both livestock and game require.

I have a request before the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee for a modest increase in research funds for the Agricultural Research Service. However, the extent of our knowledge today is such that it is not necessary to await the results of research before pushing ahead vigorously with improved management techniques. I recognize that the President's budget for this year provides for increase in range administration and soil and moisture conservation. The cooperation that I have received from this committee and particularly Chairman HAYDEN, in my effort to bring about immediate rehabilitation of burned over rangeland has resulted in the inclusion in the budget of provisions that will assure funds to meet these emergencies.

I propose that we now take another forward step and it is in line with recommendations which I have made earlier and which have been adopted in part through the actions of this committee. The Bureau of Land Management desperately needs a more adequate appropriation for soil and moisture work and range administration.

The Bureau should be in a position where it can place into effect range rehabilitation programs and in the process hold to a minimum the reduction of permitted grazing use. To put it another way, the budget for the Bureau of Land Management in this activity should be geared toward realizing in the next 10 years the capability of these lands to carry double the present quantity of livestock and to meet fully our requirements for game management. Therefore, I request that an additional appropriation of $2 million be made to be expended in areas where range surveys indicate a need to reduce permitted grazing use or where wildlife demands cannot be met at the existing level of range condition. These funds would be used for reseeding, the conversion of cheatgrass range to crested grass, the elimination of sage, fencing, and water development and more adequate cooperative management to assure proper utilization of the range. One example of the type of situation needing attention is the conflict between the use of bitterbrush by livestock and deer on deer winter ranges. For example, one study has shown that deer have overused certain areas. Research shows that the application of sound game and livestock management practices coupled with real improvements in the condition of the land can bring about a resolution of these problems.

I have had further conversations with Secretary Udall and Assistant Secretary Carver on ways and means to improve not only land management but cooperation between various groups.

As the members of this committee know, range conditions are not the same in every part of the Nation. One study showed that removing cows from a range in the Southeastern United States measurably increased the capacity of the land to grow beneficial grasses. Another study in Utah and the studies at Squaw Butte in Oregon show that removing the cows does not result in the range coming back. In still another study it has been shown that on certain western ranges the presence of rabbitbrush actually increases the production of crested wheat grass. This is contrary to one of the long-held views that brush reduces grass production. Rabbitbrush has a tap root that can drive down for water but it has poorly developed lateral roots. The crested wheat thus has no competition from rabbitbrush and thrives under and adjacent to rabbitbrush. On the other hand, big sagebrush measurably reduces the effectiveness of crested wheat grass and drives it out. In still another study it has been shown that rodents can be a primary cause of plant cover deterioration. Where livestock only had been excluded there were no marked changes in vegetative cover after 20 years but where rodents had been excluded there were marked changes in plant cover.

Therefore when I contend that cuts in range use will not always improve the range I am following the judgment of dedicated and trained researchers. The range manager must recognize the total biotic relationship. No range manager would expect to keep deer off the range with a 2-foot fence. Why should he try to restore the range for livestock and game by taking a step that just doesn't bring about the restoration?

I would like to have included with my remarks a copy of a letter I just received from an Oregon rancher, Mr. Merle Cummings. I think this letter is typical of the constructive approach that the majority of the ranchers in my State have exhibited. As Mr. Cummings points out, many of the ranchers accept the cuts simply because they believed there was no use in appealing the decisions. Mr. Cummings goes on to say, "To me this is a dangerous attitude and if permitted to continue could threaten the very democratic foundations of our free system of government."

Whenever I find that a citizen has reached the point where he thinks that it is no use to appeal a decision even though he thinks he is right, then I feel it is time for the Congress to take notice. We are protecting the basic foundation of our system of government when we show a citizen that he can get a full and fair hearing. My goals in the review I have made of the problems of our ranchers have included attention to this very vital consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I ask each of you to read this letter from Mr. Cummings. I am sure that you will then agree with the case I have made for additional range funds.

The provision of additional funds will be helpful and I have the assurance that the Secretary of the Interior intends to proceed vigorously to achieve better cooperation and constructive improvement. I ask this committee to help on this matter as it has so capably in the past.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, Senate Document No. 88 has been alluded to before. It has been ordered to be printed in the RECORD already.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD supplemental budget documents from the Department of the Interior, known as inserts 3 and 3A.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATION FOR MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Request: $1,700,000 for 12 months from July 1, 1962.

Appropriation to date: $———.

Obligations to ———, $———.

Expenditures to ———, $———.

Employment:

Average number, current appropriation: ———.

Number involved this estimate: 56.

Actual employment 2,948, February 28, 1962.

Budget estimate next fiscal year: $41,552,000.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS

A supplemental appropriation in the amount of $1,700,000 is requested to initiate the first year of the 7-year development program known as the Vale project and to otherwise greatly accelerate range rehabilitation work in Oregon.

Additional funds in the amount of $230,000 are requested to implement a balanced land treatment, management, and range use program in the Vale District. When completed, the Vale project will demonstrate the benefits which can be derived from increasing the productivity of depleted range lands.

In conjunction with this project, the first phase of an expanded fire presuppression program in the amount of $60,000 will be initiated.

Of the total, $1,385,000 is needed to assist in arresting erosion and watershed damages on the national land reserve in the Vale project area and other areas in the State of Oregon. An additional $25,000 is needed to provide adequate administrative support to this expanded Vale project and rehabilitation work in Oregon.

APPROPRIATION FOR CONSTRUCTION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Request: $300,000, to remain available until expended for —— months from July 1, 1962.

Appropriation to date: $———.

Obligations to ———, $———.

Expenditures to ———, $———.

Employment:

Average number current appropriation: 27.

Number involved this estimate: 6.

Actual employment 7, February 28, 1962.

Budget estimate next fiscal year: $1 million.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS

A supplemental appropriation in the amount of $300,000 is requested for the construction of access roads and buildings essential to the first year of the 7-year development program known as the Vale project, and to accelerate range rehabilitation work in other parts of Oregon. Of this amount $250,000 is for the construction of warehouses, offices, and other facilities essential to protecting the resource base and the materials, supplies and equipment required in the expanded rehabilitation program. The balance of $50,000 is for the design and construction of roads to provide improved access to the areas of the national land reserve in Oregon needed in the conduct of range management and rehabilitation work.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, the committee refused money for this appropriation after it was alleged by certain Members that the whole project smacked of political favoritism.

It was known by all Members that no hearings had been held in any way, shape or form, and it was recognized by all Members that some States were included specifically and others were excluded, in respect to the solution of the problem which involved some 10 or more States in all.

The Department was not discouraged by this action. No, indeed. Secretary Udall sent a letter to our Chairman on May 18 with a "revision in the details of the $2 million program of the Bureau of Land Management for range improvement in the Western States." Yes, he said, "Western States." No longer was this only an Oregon project. The Vale District of Oregon still would get most of the money, but now the Secretary included the Boise District, Idaho; the Winnemucca District, Nevada; and the Albuquerque District, New Mexico.

Again to keep the record straight, I ask unanimous consent to insert Secretary Udall's letter and accompanying revised documents at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1962.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Transmitted herewith is a revision in the details of the $2 million program of the Bureau of Land Management for range improvement in the Western States.

The proposed changes provide a broader area of application to areas in need of improvement.

The restoration of $2 million for the revised program will be greatly appreciated.

The Bureau of the Budget advised that there is no objection to the modification in the details of the program.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT—ADDITIONAL DATA REGARDING BUDGET AMENDMENT 1963 FOR ACCELERATED RANGE REHABILITATION ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Many years of heavy use by wildlife and domestic livestock, wild fires, and other abuses accentuated by drouths and wind and water erosion have destroyed much of the vegetative cover on the public lands. Over 30 percent of the rangelands are in poor or bad condition. Only 20 percent is improving while the balance is static or becoming worse. Livestock operators are facing continual reductions in herd numbers because of dwindling forage production. Livestock is the backbone of the economy in greater portions of the Western States and reduction in livestock numbers create a difficult situation not only for the range livestock producer, but also for communities of the area. Destruction of the vegetative cover has further resulted in the deterioration of watersheds. Irreplaceable soil is being lost from the range through sheet and gully erosion, and uncontrolled runoff from these watersheds is causing downstream losses and destruction by flooding and sedimentation.

The only alternative to permanent reductions in grazing use and continued flood and sediment damages downstream is the restoration of these lands to full productivity. The Vale District in Oregon, the Boise District in Idaho, the Winnemucca District in Nevada, and the Rio Puerco drainage in the Albuquerque District in New Mexico symbolize many of the major problems in present-day Federal land resource management. Production can be restored in these areas by the intensive application of already proven treatments and practices. These project areas will constitute pilot areas of significant size to furnish much-needed demonstrations of the value of effective conservation management on our national land.

VALE DISTRICT, OREGON

Acceleration of the rehabilitation of the range resources in the Vale District requires the application of vegetative improvement projects coupled with fences, livestock water and other facilities for the protection, management and use of range areas during and following treatment. The following are major practices which will be accomplished during the first year of the project:

Practice:	*Units to be accomplished*
Range seeding (acres)	13,000
Brush control (acres)	16,000
Fencing (miles)	50
Water developments (number)	40
Range use facilities (number)	16

BOISE DISTRICT, IDAHO

Restoration of resources on the public lands in the Boise District requires the accelerated application of those practices which will result in the improvement of the vegetative cover. The soil and climate are conducive to vegetative growth and lend themselves to established methods of range seeding and brush control. Water developments and range facilities for the protection and management of improved areas are also needed.

The following major accomplishments are planned for the first year of the project:

Practice:	*Units to be accomplished*
Range seeding (acres)	6,000
Brush control (acres)	8,000
Fencing (miles)	30
Water developments (number)	20

WINNEMUCCA DISTRICT, NEVADA

The invasion of brush and other undesirable plants following heavy grazing in the Winnemucca District requires that brush and weed control measures be intensified to restore watershed values and forage production. Perennial grasses over much of the area have been reduced in abundance until adapted species must be established to replace them. Rehabilitation must consist of brush and weed control supported by water development, fencing, and other range use facilities needed in protecting treated areas and enabling the establishment of sound systems of grazing management. The following major accomplishments are planned for the first year of the project:

Practice:	*Units to be accomplished*
Range seeding (acres)	8,500
Brush control (acres)	11,000
Fencing (miles)	35
Water developments (number)	25

ALBUQUERQUE DISTRICT, NEW MEXICO (RIO PUERCO)

More than 500,000 acre-feet of soil has been scooped out of valley fill and scalped from the upland topsoils in the Rio Puerco drainage, creating havoc locally and downstream. A number of villages have been abandoned, irrigation farming has had to be abandoned, and grazing drastically reduced. The Rio Puerco contributes over half the silt which obstructs the channel of the Rio Grande and fills the basin of Elephant Butte Dam, but only one-sixteenth of the water. Corrective measures involve temporary impoundment of flood runoff near its source by land treatment measures such as contouring, deep ripping and by detention and diversion dams. Treated areas also require protection from uncontrolled grazing use. The following accomplishments are planned for the first year of the project:

Practice:	*Units to be accomplished*
Detention dams (number)	25
Diversion dams (number)	14
Fences (miles)	70
Land treatment (acres)	8,000

Funds required by activities— Colorado and Wyoming

Location—Districts	Management of lands and resources			Construction		Total
	Management	Soil and moisture	General administration	Roads	Buildings	
Vale	$290,000	$510,000		$35,000	$165,000	$1,000,000
Boise		200,000		15,000	85,000	300,000
Winnemucca		250,000				250,000
Albuquerque-Rio Puerco		425,000				425,000
General administration			$25,000			25,000
Total	290,000	1,385,000	25,000	50,000	250,000	2,000,000

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, it is clear that we need range improvement work. Almost every Western State needs such work. I certainly favor it, as I said in the committee. However, I think it is important to the protection of all the States and our national interest that there be a public hearing in respect to the question. The responsible officials of government should come before the committee. Those who are concerned in Colorado, in California, in Utah, and in other States have a right to present their cases to the Committee on Appropriations, so that we can write a long-range program, starting somewhere—and perhaps it should start in Vale; I do not know. We should proceed in a definite, orderly manner toward the solution of the problem, instead of singling out a few States for a project and ignoring the others. I do not think we should lay ourselves open to charges of that kind.

The committee acted wisely in refusing the money, even though it received supplemental and varied requests from the Bureau, with its stubborn tenacity, in an effort to try to get some money somewhere. The committee acted wisely and properly.

I suggest, Madam President, that the Senate should reject the amendment, if it is pressed for a vote. If it does so, I assure the Senators who have this problem in their areas that we shall be glad to hear, in supplemental hearings, a request to cover the whole area.

In my own mind, Madam President, it might be more appropriate on this occasion to move to lay the Morse amendment on the table. This would have the effect of keeping the subject before the Committee on Appropriations and providing an opportunity for hearings, which would permit Representatives and Senators from all 17 States to present their problems. It would permit department officials to present their "cure," so that we could subject it to analysis, criticism, modification, and change.

Whether I shall make a motion to lay on the table, or whether any other Senator will do so, has not been decided, but it has been decided that if such is not done, there should be a yea-and-nay vote, for Senators to decide whether they wish to engage in this type of specialized legislation for four States in seeking to solve a problem existing in a great many States. Senators must decide whether they wish to appropriate $2 million without a single syllable of hearings before the committee from the Bureau and the Department responsible for handling the funds.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. CARROLL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I wish to summarize the position of the advocates of the amendment and to clear up the confusion over this problem created by Senators who have opposed it.

First, it was never contemplated that this would be solely an Oregon project. Attention was called to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget issued a statement on April 2 which erroneously referred to it as an Oregon project.

The administration proceeded forthwith to correct that error, and made it perfectly clear that the project was developed for a new program of range rehabilitation under the Taylor Grazing Act and that it would cover projects which, in the opinion of the Department of the Interior, were ready to move forward based upon the recommendations of the Advisory Council, which had been called back to Washington for a week and had devised the new program.

The senior Senator from Oregon testified before the Appropriations Committee. I do not know why Senators continue to insist that there were no hearings, unless a Senator, as he appears before an Appropriations Committee, goes through gestures that have no influence on the Appropriations Committee. The senior Senator from Oregon testified. He explained the project to the Appropriations Committee. The administration sent up its communications in regard to the project. The President sent up his communication making clear that the proposal had the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and his approval.

Colorado, Wyoming, and other States not referred to in the material that the Department of the Interior sent up will be included in the program, which, I announce again, is a new program under the Taylor Grazing Act. I call attention to the fact that each year the Appropriations Committee appropriates money to the Department of the Interior for the administration of the Taylor Grazing Act, and no bill of particulars is presented to the Appropriations Committee as to where each dollar shall go under the administration of the Taylor Grazing Act.

That is an administrative function of the Department of the Interior. It so happens, in order to explain this new program, that the Department of the Interior advised the Appropriations Committee through the communications system how it proposed to administer the $2 million, but it is in exactly the same form in which members on the Appropriations Committee have been appropriating money for years gone by. Funds are appropriated to the Department of the Interior for the administration of the Taylor Grazing Act.

The project is one which many of the opponents have said they are all for in principle, but the fact is that they do not want to appropriate the money.

I think the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] let the cat out of the bag as to why some Senators on the other side of the aisle do not want to appropriate the money. I have not been in the Senate for almost 18 years without developing the ability to smell a political maneuver when its odor is as strong as the odor is here today. It is apparent that certain Senators on the other side of the aisle are of the opinion that they might help WAYNE MORSE get reelected if this amendment were to pass. I cannot interpret some of the statements on the other side, including that of the Senator from Delaware, in any other vein.

I would be less than human if I did not say that I am sorry those comments were made, because I am proud of the record I have made over the years in fighting for range rehabilitation.

This is the culmination of a fight I have waged year after year. The Senator from South Dakota has said that politics are never played in the Appropriations Committee. I hope not. I understand that on the day the provision was gutted in the Appropriations Committee there were present about eight Republicans and four Democrats. I cannot ignore what I think is a pretty clear inference as to what happened in the Appropriations Committee. I regret that the chairman of the committee apparently was not armed with proxies on that occasion.

We must face the reality of the situation. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee advised me to offer the measure as an amendment to the bill on the floor of the Senate, which is exactly what I have done today. I betray no secret when I say that the leader on the other side of the aisle discussed what happened in the Appropriations Committee in regard to this subject. It was understood that I would offer the amendment today because it is meritorious. There are Senators on the other side of the aisle, including an absentee member of the Appropriations Committee, who have told me it is meritorious, and have assured me that they would vote for it when the roll was called.

I do not think that what I have described is the way to deal with great interests in our country with reference to public lands. I do not think it is the way to deal with the advisory councils, Republicans and Democrats alike, that serve under the Taylor Grazing Act and have served for years. They came back to Washington, planned the program, and submitted it to the administration, and it was approved by the Department of the Interior and by the President of the United States.

In my judgment, Senators of both parties from the West cannot deny the fact that the proposal would be a great march forward in range rehabilitation. The record is made.

Let me say most respectfully, but frankly, that what we have heard is a diversionary tactic—to say, "Beat it today, and then start all over in a supplemental bill sometime later."

The people of the West are entitled to have the program approved now. Senators who are interested in it have a clear duty. As the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has made clear earlier today, they will discuss with those in authority in the Bureau of Land Management how the money shall be administered procedurally under the Taylor Grazing Act.

I point out that the proposal would be an appropriation for the administration of the Taylor Grazing Act. We have made appropriations for the administration of that act for years. We have not asked the Department of the Interior to tell the Senate how each dollar would be spent. Representatives of the Department have said that for range rehabilitation they need so much money under the Taylor Grazing Act. But they have been very forthright with the Senate this year. They have told us that there should be some changes as recommended by their advisory council for range rehabilitation. If that is the case, I am perfectly willing to rest on the case made. I am perfectly willing to have Senators assume their own responsibility for their votes on the issue.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. How long has the senior Senator from Oregon been fighting for appropriations for range rehabilitation?

Mr. MORSE. This is my 18th year.

Mr. CARROLL. How many times have appropriations been granted for the specific purpose of range rehabilitation?

Mr. MORSE. I answer the question by saying that I do not know of any times for this specific purpose, because the plan is a new one. But many times appropriations have been made to the Department of the Interior for administering the Taylor Grazing Act.

Mr. CARROLL. I recall that I testified in 1960 before the Appropriations Committee and asked for a specific appropriation for the specific program.

Mr. MORSE. So did I.

Mr. CARROLL. The request was denied. I heard on the floor of the Senate today that we should believe in a program of range rehabilitation. As the Senator from Oregon said earlier in his discussion, I called the Bureau of Land Management. I wanted to know what they would do with reference to the State which I represent in part. I was told very clearly, "Senator, if we have the money, we will do it."

I said, "Suppose you get $2 million. I want you to consider the problems in my State in relation to a proposed appropriation of $2 million."

He said, "We will do it."

Mr. MORSE. Surely. He should.

Mr. CARROLL. For that reason, I made the parliamentary inquiry. I do not want the RECORD to show that the appropriation would be for a specific purpose. It would be covered under the general provisions of the bill related to the Bureau of Land Management, and the money might be impounded by the Bureau of the Budget. It might very well be impounded by the Bureau of the Budget. But it seems to me that in the first step forward in all these years, it would be a step backward for me to vote to reject the amendment merely because I do not have some specific assurance about my State. I commend the able Senator from Oregon. I do not know whether Oregon will get a million dollars or not. If I think it may, I assure the Senator that I shall try to get a little of the money for Colorado. There is a national advisory group. We must repose confidence in volunteer groups who believe in range rehabilitation.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CARROLL. Not having had other appropriations in other fiscal years, although I have asked for them, I think it is a serious mistake to turn our backs on the first effort we have made in the direction of range rehabilitation. I intend to support the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. I rest my case.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, I know that the Senator from Oregon is a kindly and fair man. He is the proud author of the Morse formula, which has won widespread support among his colleagues in the Senate on the basis that it applies fairly and equitably to every State.

I believe that the Senator from Oregon is a little out of character when he makes the broad charge that any Senator on this side of the aisle who opposes his amendment is motivated by some political desire to embarrass the Senator from Oregon. There is not one Senator from any of the Western States who does not wholeheartedly support the comments made by the Senator from Oregon insofar as the importance of range reseeding and range management on the public domain is concerned. There is not a Senator, regardless of which party he is affiliated with, who does not share that concern.

During the deliberations of the Appropriations Subcommittee there never has been any opposition on that basis. There have been disagreements over whether we should appropriate more money or less money, or whether we can accelerate a program. Why all this urgency and haste?

I have before me the Bureau of Land Management justification, page 47, dealing with soil and moisture conservation.

The amount available in 1961 was $5,116,817. The amount available in 1962 was $6,413,530. The estimate for 1963 is $8,525,000. That is an increase of $2,111,470 over last year. That is an increase of approximately 35 percent to enable the Bureau of Land Management to accelerate the soil and moisture conservation program, and reflects the considered judgment of the Bureau of Land Management. That was approved by the Committee on Appropriations, and I am sure the increased budget will also be approved by the Senate in voting for the appropriation which has been submitted. I do not mean the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, but the bill brought to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations.

I find on BLM page 49 some detail with respect to the program of $8½ million. Brush control and range seeding are mentioned, both in terms of acres. In 1962 there were 237,289 range seeding acres. In the program for 1963 there will be 290,000 acres of range seeding, or an increase of 53,000 acres.

I have BLM page 84, which is the justification on range improvement. I find that the appropriation in 1961 was $863,070. In 1962, it was $739,842. For the coming year the estimate is $1,044,750. That is an increase of $304,908. That means an increase of 40 percent in that specific program for range improvement under the direction of the Bureau of Land Management.

I have called attention to these two appropriation items for the Bureau of Land Management to prove the liberality and the desire of the Appropriations Committee to support this program in the normal way, which requires matching from 25 to 40 percent by the local participants in these programs.

I am fearful that we are in danger of setting up a new precedent whereby we can get through an authorization for a particular project in a favored area without the requirement of local matching.

What will happen, then, to the program that we have followed for many years, which has been accepted by every interest, particularly the grazers on the public domain, to the extent that they are willing to make local matching in these programs?

The Senator from Oregon may have some personal justifiable reasons for asking for this preferential treatment. However, he has heard comments made by his colleagues from other public land States in the West, all of whom agree basically with his concept for an expanded public domain improvement and reseeding, which will ultimately bring more revenue through grazing fees.

However, I believe that the Senator from Oregon is not entirely fair when he says the State of Idaho, the State of Nevada, and the State of New Mexico were in the original concept, because the RECORD is replete with evidence to show that it was 4 days after the markup and reporting of the appropriation bill before the Assistant Secretary of the Interior submitted additional data. I may not use the same dictionary the Senator from Oregon uses, but I believe I know what "additional data" means. It means information that was not submitted by the Bureau of Land Management to our committee when this subject was before us for consideration originally.

I am reluctant to bring up this item, but at the time the subcommittee was considering this particular request I happened to read in the Idaho States-

man, of Boise, Idaho, which serves eastern Oregon, including the Vale District, the following dispatch:

VALE BLM TO SPRAY SAGEBRUSH

PORTLAND, OREG.—Six thousand acres of sagebrush and rabbit brush in the Vale district of the Bureau of Land Management will be aerial-sprayed between now and the end of June, Russell E. Getty, BLM State director, announced Wednesday.

The syraying program, Getty said, is part of a BLM range improvement program. Control of brush releases perennial native grasses for the benefit of livestock and certain species of wildlife, he added.

Getty said when good native grass is sparse or nonexistent the BLM seeds the sprayed areas with crested wheatgrass.

Getty also issued a forecast of forage conditions on public rangelands in the Vale area.

As of April 1 the conditions in the north part of the district were 13 percent above normal; in the central part they were 4 percent below normal and in the south 13 percent above normal.

The article, if it correctly states the facts, in quoting the Bureau of Land Management director in the Portland, Oreg. district, which includes the Vale district, shows that there is no immediate need or urgency for the proposed action at this time. Assurances have been given by Republicans serving on the committee, as well as by Democrats, who come from the States that are not included in the emergency program, that a supplemental appropriation bill will be considered soon and that there will be ample opportunity for the Bureau of Land Management to submit a detailed report or recommendation, not for one or two or three States, but, rather, for the negotiation of a farflung rehabilitation program throughout the 10 public land States of the West. I believe the State of Washington, represented by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], is not interested in this program.

So only 10 of the 11 Western States participate.

If the Senator from Oregon would be as fair as are Senators on both sides of the aisle who serve on the Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations and study the estimates, justifications, and programs year after year, and would act in accord with his long record in this body, he would not seek the preferential treatment which would result in discrimination against other States of the West which are in exactly the same category as is his own great State of Oregon.

I think the amendment ought to be laid on the table without prejudice. In the next month or two, when the supplemental appropriation bill is considered, there will be an opportunity to proceed in a regular, orderly manner. A program can be presented which will be fair to all the States, and the Senator from Oregon will then receive the plaudits and acclaim of the States of the West, because he will have had a share in expanding this program.

Mr. President, I move that the amendment be laid on the table.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on that motion, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The motion is not debatable. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator From Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 84 Leg.]

YEAS—30

Allott	Eastland	Pearson
Beall	Fong	Prouty
Bennett	Goldwater	Proxmire
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Butler	Hruska	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Keating	Smith, Maine
Carlson	McClellan	Stennis
Curtis	Miller	Wiley
Dirksen	Morton	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—44

Anderson	Gruening	Metcalf
Bartlett	Hart	Monroney
Bible	Hartke	Morse
Burdick	Hickey	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Muskie
Cannon	Humphrey	Neuberger
Carroll	Jackson	Pastore
Church	Kefauver	Randolph
Clark	Kuchel	Smith, Mass.
Cooper	Lausche	Sparkman
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Douglas	Magnuson	Talmadge
Engle	Mansfield	Yarborough
Ervin	McCarthy	Young, Ohio
Gore	McGee	

NOT VOTING—26

Aiken	Hayden	Murphy
Bush	Hill	Pell
Capehart	Javits	Russell
Case, N.J.	Johnston	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Thurmond
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Tower
Ellender	Long, La.	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McNamara	

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of today and also for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if it is possible to reach a vote on the Morse amendment, I think we would seriously consider adjourning shortly thereafter; and I should like to suggest to the distinguished minority leader and to all other Senators that, if they find it agreeable to do so, the Senate convene tomorrow morning at 11 a.m.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield, I have no objection to having the session tomorrow convene at 11 a.m., but I understand that the chairman of the Finance Committee has arranged to have the Secretary of the Treasury appear before the committee at that time;

and I have an amendment to offer to this bill, also.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Delaware has mentioned that fact. Therefore, I propose that the session tomorrow convene at 12 o'clock noon.

If action can be completed on the Morse amendment this afternoon, I wonder whether it will also be possible today to complete action on the Magnuson amendment, which will not take too long. There will be many other amendments to consider tomorrow.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I have a brief statement which I wish to make today, if possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if final action is taken today on the Morse and Magnuson amendments, Senators can then take all the time they may wish to take.

At this time, I hope the Senate will proceed to vote on the Morse amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], on behalf of himself and certain other Senators. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I desire to take only a minute or two to inform the many Senators who were not present earlier of the present legislative situation and the pending issue.

The Senate now has before it an amendment to increase by $2 million the appropriations called for by the bill. This proposed increase would be above the amount recommended by the committee, and it involves an item on which no committee hearings were held.

It involves an amount as to which, it seems to me, if we are going to start to legislate increases on an appropriation bill in the face of the serious fiscal situation in which this country finds itself, we should at least recognize our responsibility to the taxpayers and to the Treasury to the extent that we do not legislate increases on items which have not even been heard by the committee.

Each Member must be his own custodian of his responsibility in fiscal matters. I simply wanted Senators, who were not present to hear the discussion, know what is involved in the issue.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate voting against the amendment. I shall vote against it because it tends to increase the amount recommended by the committee.

I have no faith in the argument which has been made that the Senator from Oregon charted this amount to be assigned to Oregon, and to no other States. Basically, I would vote against this amendment because of the increase proposed. I want it clearly understood that my vote will not be cast upon the basis that the Senator from Oregon tried to channel this money into Oregon, and no other place.

Mr. MORSE. I have already given my assurance that that is not so.

DRUG LEGISLATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I wish to take but a few minutes, but I wanted to make this statement while the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and other Senators were present to hear the statement.

Mr. President, today a severe blow to the public interest was delivered in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Most of the drug manufacturing industry and its acolytes have been punching away for some time at S. 1522, which is designed to make vital prescription drugs available to the people at reasonable prices.

Today they swung a "haymaker" and just about knocked this bill right out of the ring.

I refuse to believe that my colleagues in the U.S. Senate will let this sorely needed legislation go down "for the count" in this way. The people of this country want more reasonably priced drugs; they want safer, more accurately and honestly advertised drugs.

Some polls have shown that 60 to 70 percent of the people would be for price-controlled drugs. I am not for price control, however, because I believe the same thing can be accomplished by way of competition.

But whatever test we attempt, whether cost of manufacture, foreign prices, or bids to the Government, the cost of prescription drugs is and has been for some time unreasonably high.

I think the time has come for the spotlight to be turned on so that the people of this country can see who is on which side.

The people of this country want and are entitled to know about our efforts to try to get more reasonable prices for prescription drugs, safer drugs, and accurately advertised drugs.

As of now, these and other necessary and important objectives are in great jeopardy. That is why I want now to review the history of this struggle so that my colleagues and the public will know the facts.

Two and a half years ago the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly began a full-scale investigation of the drug manufacturing industry. It was the finding of the subcommittee, embodied in Senate Report No. 448, dated June 27, 1961, of the 87th Congress, that the prices charged for prescription drugs are exorbitantly high and that the profits of the leading manufacturers were excessive. We also found that a number of changes in the law should be made to assure that prescription drugs will be safer as well as less expensive.

The major recommendations of our subcommittee were embodied in S. 1552, the Drug Industry Antitrust Act. Very lengthy hearings were held on this bill and everyone who wished to be heard was permitted to testify. This bill, with certain amendments, was approved by the subcommittee several months ago. When the amended bill was referred back to the Committee on the Judiciary, it was rereferred to the Patents Subcommittee. That subcommittee recommended the deletion of certain provisions in the bill and, upon the initiation of its chairman, Senator MCCLELLAN, made certain changes in the remaining patent provisions. The bill was then sent back to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill as further amended, received the strong endorsement of the President of the United States in the form of a letter to Senator EASTLAND, dated April 10, 1962. I request unanimous consent that this letter, a copy of which I have here, be placed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1962.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: In the message I sent to the Congress on March 14, I called attention to the need for new legislative authority to advance and protect the interests of consumers in the marketing of drugs.

S. 1552, which is now pending before your committee, incorporates the major recommendations I made. It will strengthen and broaden existing laws in the food and drug field, contribute toward better, safer, and less expensive medicines, and establish a better system of enforcement. As you know, the bill is the outgrowth of 28 months of intensive investigation and hearings by your Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. I believe that early passage of this legislation will substantially improve the ability of the drug industry to serve the Nation and help provide consumers with quality drugs at low competitive prices.

I understand that the members of the Subcommittee on Patents have decided that the compulsory licensing feature of the legislation requires further study and consideration. I would hope that this would not, however, delay enactment of the other provisions of the bill—provisions which will establish necessary safeguards to assure the reliability and effectiveness of drugs placed on the market, provide for standardization of drug names, and thereby encourage physicians to prescribe drugs by nonproprietary rather than by brand names, require disclosure of adverse as well as beneficial effects of drugs in drug promotion, and assure consideration of therapeutic effectiveness in the granting of patents for drugs that are modifications of other drugs.

The message I sent to the Congress made several other suggestions which, it would seem to me, might appropriately be included in the bill now before your committee. They are:

1. Drug manufacturers should be required to keep records on, and report to, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare any indications of adverse effects from the use of a new drug or antibiotic.

Senator from Tennessee wanted to sell us on the idea that we should amend the patent section of the Sherman Act in a drug bill. I suggest that Senators should read the proposed language. It is most intriguing. One is almost required to have a book of logarithms, a slide rule, and a U.S. Pharmacopoeia to read and understand it. My good friend talks about confusion. Sometimes there is confusion confounded.

Then, of course, in addition to other conditions and requirements for patentability, there is the question of the patentability of a drug. Under the proposed title no patent may be granted for any modification of any patented or unpatented drug or for any combination of two or more drugs unless the Commissioner determines that the therapeutic effect of such modification is substantially greater than that of the drug so modified.

What does that mean? It takes some puzzling to find out what that language means, except that we know it is a modification of the Patent Act. Why was it placed in this measure? The distinguished Senator from Tennessee put it in. He thinks we ought to lie back and accept it. In the interest of the preservation of a great patent system and a great drug industry, the provision was stricken.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The provision was recommended after extensive hearings. It was recommended by the President of the United States in his letter, and was modified by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] in his amendment. The language, "Or some other substantial advantage over the drug so modified" was strongly recommended by the Commissioner of Patents. The Commissioner of Patents gave his reasons, saying that the courts had eliminated the utility test in connection with drugs, and he noted the language as modified by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] which would require him to pass upon whether drugs should be patented or not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator is an opinion and is not borne out by the record. I think that has been disclosed.

With respect to compulsory licensing, what an alien provision to put in our patent structure. I know one company that spent $31 million in research on a definite drug and its many derivatives. How can they get it back in 3 years? What do they do? They back off and say, "That leaves us no incentive for research."

Somehow they must get it back. That is why we insisted on striking out that provision. Who put it in there in the first place? We did not put it in the bill. It came from our distinguished friend from Tennessee.

I was gloriously written up in Mr. Drew Pearson's column as being one of those trying to increase the price of drugs. We are merely trying to keep a patent section intact in the hope of preserving the incentive of our free enterprise system. That goes also for registration. The section referred to is not a registration section. It is a licensing provision.

Senators should read the conditions precedent and the conditions under which a license could be suspended. The burden of proof is upon the industry to prove to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the industry ought to have their license back.

That has no place in the American system. I know that my gracious friend from Tennessee nurtures and cherishes those feelings with a deep conviction. But with an equally deep conviction I do not share them. I intend to fight them on every occasion. I am glad that the Committee on the Judiciary has reached such prestige now that it can hold its hearings in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one correction?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator said that if a drug manufacturer was manufacturing drugs, the HEW could put him out of business, and the burden was on him to show that he had the proper sanitation, and so forth. The bill from the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation, of course, would require that the Commissioner of Health, Education, and Welfare obtain an injunction, and the burden would be on him to show that he did not have proper sanitation. So the Senator got that wrong, I am sorry to say.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, the Senator from Illinois did not get it wrong. The job we had was to sell the proposal in the subcommittee. The subcommittee has been at meetings in the minority leader's office a good many times. We merely stroll over there from here, and then day after day we discuss the bill about which we are speaking. I do not know how long those discussions have gone on. But putting the burden of proof in every case upon the industry or the person engaged in industry is not proper. On one previous occasion when a bill that dealt with mergers, and so forth, was before the Senate the then chairman of the subcommittee from the other side of the aisle invited the head of the Antitrust Division under the Eisenhower administration to come to my office. We sat around and talked. Finally the head of the Antitrust Division said to me, "Do you know what you are doing, Senator DIRKSEN?"

I said, "I certainly do."

He said, "What you are trying to do is to let industry pick its own battleground in a fight with Government."

I said, "What do you think I am trying to do if it is not that, in the interest of preserving a great, free system that has done so much, and whose incentives must be preserved."

Mr. President, we are as desirous as anyone else to get a good drug bill. I think if the amendments are agreed to, we will get a good drug bill. I salute the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee. He presides over a great committee. He does it efficiently. He does what a chairman ought to do. When his administration asks for a bill, he is up against a stalemate. Then, of course, he calls in consultants and asks, "Can you fashion something that will be agreeable to all sides and yet effectively do the job?"

I salute him for the great chairman that he is.

Now we will carry this proposal back to the Judiciary Committee. We are supposed to meet tomorrow morning. I do not know how long the meeting will take. There will be about 8 or 10 amendments. I hope we shall deal with them expeditiously. I am even willing to agree with my distinguished friend from Tennessee that, with the consent of the committee, we take 5 minutes on a side on each amendment. In an hour and 30 minutes we can get a Senate bill on the calendar.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on behalf of himself and other Senators. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] who, if he were present, would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Loui-

siana [Mr. LONG] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea," and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON and Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 28, as follows:

[No. 85 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Anderson	Gruening	Metcalf
Bartlett	Hart	Monroney
Bible	Hartke	Morse
Burdick	Hickey	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Muskie
Cannon	Jackson	Neuberger
Carroll	Kefauver	Pastore
Church	Kerr	Smith, Mass.
Cooper	Kuchel	Sparkman
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Dworshak	Magnuson	Talmadge
Eastland	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ervin	McGee	Young, Ohio

NAYS—28

Allott	Goldwater	Pearson
Beall	Hayden	Prouty
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Boggs	Holland	Robertson
Butler	Hruska	Scott
Carlson	Keating	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Lausche	Wiley
Dirksen	Miller	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Morton	
Fong	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—30

Aiken	Fulbright	Murphy
Bush	Gore	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Hill	Randolph
Capehart	Javits	Russell
Case, N.J.	Johnston	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Smathers
Chavez	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Clark	Long, La.	Thurmond
Cotton	McClellan	Tower
Dodd	McNamara	Young, N. Dak.

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of its business tonight, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no further votes tonight. It is my understanding that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] will offer an amendment which will be made the pending business. The amendment relates to access roads.

Before the amendment is offered, the Senator from Oregon desires to have the Senate take action on a concurrent resolution which he is prepared to submit.

TRANSIT FARES FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—CORRECTION OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Senate bill 1745, relating to fares for schoolchildren in the District of Columbia, has been sent to the White House. When the bill was engrossed by the House, one word was inadvertently omitted. It has been asked that a concurrent resolution, which I now send to the desk, be agreed to, so that the bill can be returned from the White House and the correction made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 78) will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 1745) entitled "An Act to amend the Act of August 5, 1955, relating to the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia"; that upon its return, the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate in signing the said bill be deemed to be rescinded; and that in the reenrollment of said bill, the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to make the following change, viz: On page 2, line 3, of the engrossed bill, after the word "return", insert the word "established".

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Oregon if the concurrent resolution has been cleared with the leadership?

Mr. MORSE. It has been cleared with the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 78) was considered and agreed to.

DEATH OF DAVID MULHOLLAND, A PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, last Saturday David Mulholland, 23, son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Mulholland, of Quincy, Mass., and a Peace Corps volunteer in the Philippines, died at Clark Air Force Base Hospital, Manila. He was the first volunteer from my home State of Massachusetts to die serving his country in the Peace Corps.

David graduated from Tufts University in 1960 and joined the Peace Corps after working as a reporter on the Worcester Evening Gazette. He was sent by the Corps to Ilog, several hundred miles from Manila, and worked there as a teacher's aid. The Peace Corps representative in the Philippines described him as one of the ablest and most popular volunteers. He was a part of a group that organized Camp Brotherhood, the first free camp for children in the Philippines.

David's parents were at his bedside when he died. I know that the sympathy of all of us go to them today. At a time when all Americans are being asked to make sacrifices in our struggle to secure the friendship of people in distant lands, they have made the greatest sacrifice of all.

Director Sargent Shriver of the Corps said about David:

> His willingness to give of himself to others is in the highest and brightest traditions of his country.

I add to Mr. Shriver's statement that I feel David showed all of us that peacetime service to our country in this era of global, cold war conflict can involve sacrifices as great as any during a time of real war. We owe a great debt to him and all other Americans who have chosen to serve abroad helping the people of countries less fortunate than our own.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 31, after line 7, to insert an item of "$6,000,000." The amendment relates to access roads and, I understand, will be discussed tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

ACCESS ROADS

For acquiring by condemnation or otherwise additional roads needed for access to national forest lands in carrying out the Act of June 4, 1897, as amended (16 U.S.C. 471, 472, 475, 476, 551), $6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. What was the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget for this item?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Bureau of the Budget requested $2 million.

Mr. HOLLAND. What amount was provided in the House bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House eliminated the item entirely.

Mr. HOLLAND. So the Senator's proposal is to raise by $4 million the amount of $2 million requested by the Bureau of the Budget and denied by the House?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it would be helpful if the Senator from Washington made a brief explanation of the amendment, because he is proposing a substantial increase. I support his amendment completely; I think it is necessary. Still, it would be helpful if the Senator would make a brief statement in explanation of his proposal.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement in explanation of my amendment. I think the statement will explain clearly why I favor the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF WARREN G. MAGNUSON ON H.R. 10802: MAGNUSON AMENDMENT ON ACCESS ROADS

On behalf of my colleagues and myself from the Northwest, I offer an amendment which would increase the funds appropriated to the Forest Service for the item "access roads" from $2 million to $6 million.

I shall explain briefly the urgent need for these additional funds, but first I would like to explain why this action is occurring today on the floor of the Senate. As the chairman of the committee knows, it was my intent to offer this amendment in committee when the bill was marked up. I was unable to be in the city on the day of the markup and thus it was not possible for me to personally present my amendment. However, while the amendment bears my name, I have offered it on behalf of myself and Senator JACKSON, the Senators from Oregon and Montana, and our colleague from Idaho, the junior Senators, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. ENGLE, and Mr. KUCHEL.

On page 1124 of the hearings is a table which shows that of all the major Forest Service programs the one which is most under-financed is their road program. The planned level for funds is slightly over $75 million, a gap of $14 million. This amendment would further narrow the gap by $4 million.

We believe that the adoption of this amendment is of the utmost importance. Over the past several months it has become evident that the American timber industry has been experiencing competitive difficulties in marketing lumber due to the inroads which have been made by Canadian producers.

The central purpose of this amendment is to provide vitally needed funds now which will provide access on existing private roads which traverse the national forests. These roads serve almost 20 billion board feet of timber. These public timber stands in our national forests have an estimated allowable cut of timber of close to one-quarter of a billion board feet. In addition, in these stands there is an annual average timber loss due to insects and disease of over 60 million board feet.

The availability of these roads will accomplish several laudable purposes. First I would like to stress that the contemplated expenditure of $6 million is an investment. In 1 year alone $5 million in Federal revenues from the sale of timber will be returned to the Treasury. Perpetual revenues of at least $4 million a year will continue to accrue to the Federal Treasury. Thus, this $6 million investment will be paid back in a little over 1 year's time. I would, therefore, submit that from the standpoint of financial attractiveness we cannot defer this necessary work.

Secondly, our forest products industry is suffering from competition with the Canadians. One of the most critical aspects is that Canadian stumpage appears in some instances to be somewhat less costly to their producers than is ours. The Forest Service has submitted a report which shows that, while the appraised rates for both Canadian and American timber are reasonably comparable, the actual cost of the stumpage from public lands in the United States compared to the cost of stumpage from public lands in Canada becomes considerably higher because our mills must bid more vigorously to secure this public timber.

Canadian timber sells at a few percentage points above the appraised price whereas our Forest Service timber sells at 25 to 50 percent above appraised prices. Increasing the amount of timber that can be offered for sale will still provide that the Government receives the full value. The figures that I have cited on timber value represent the Forest Service estimate of appraised values not the prices resulting from competitive bids. If we can increase the amount of timber offered for sale our domestic producers will have to bid so vigorously against each other. Their costs will be reduced and the entire industry will be better able to meet the burden of Canadian competition.

The amendment is promised financially on the concept that it is better to sell 100 units of timber at $20 than to sell 50 units at $40. High stumpage prices cripple the industry's ability to compete with Canada.

Thus this appropriation offers a solid and realistic way to assist the lumber industry of this country.

This industry has stated repeatedly that it does not seek subsidies. I would emphasize that the appropriation of these funds can in no way be defined as a subsidy. The price of timber depends upon many factors, one of which is the presence or absence of a road. When a road is available, the price of the timber is higher than when it is necessary for the successful bidder to construct a road. In this case, the Government will have purchased a partial interest in private logging roads which traverse national forest lands and the price of the timber will reflect the availability of the roads.

When this appropriation was before the House Appropriations Committee, they decided to eliminate it, giving as their reason a decision by the Comptroller General rendered on March 2 of this year to the effect that the purchase of these roads could be accomplished under the funds made available for forest development roads and trails under the Highway Act. When this appropriation item was first placed in the budget 4 years ago there was some question as to whether forest road and trail funds could be used to purchase an interest in a private road and to recapture the share not attributable to Federal timber so that there would be no subsidy to private parties. This special appropriation provided for the recapture and did not attempt to settle that issue. The Comptroller has now held that the fees that would be collected are not in the nature of a toll and thus not prohibited by the Federal Highway Act. However, the Comptroller General's decision did not make any more money available because as we all know the Highway Act authorization sets forth certain amounts and the budget provides the necessary funds to liquidate this authorization. This special fund, therefore, is of absolute necessity. If we are going to act now to bring the type of economic stability to our lumber industry that the present situation requires, I think I can forecast that in the light of the Comptroller General's decision and the action that we expect may be taken on pending authorization requests for subsequent years, it will not be necessary to continue this special program.

I would emphasize, however, that we are faced with a practical reality. The conduct of the Forest Service timber sale program hinges on the availability of road funds. The Forest Service has made certain plans based upon its budget request. It needs more funds for essential road construction for timber harvesting in many areas. The availability of this $6 million under the special access road appropriation will actually "free up" the funds in the forest road and trail appropriation so that there can be a substantial increase in the construction of roads and thus in the marketing of National Forest timber.

When the cotton and textile agreement legislation was before the Senate, there was debate upon an amendment which if adopted would have held up the cotton and textile agreement until agreements were reached on limiting the importation of timber and certain other agricultural products. A number of us were unwilling to support this proposal because it did not seem realistic to hold up agreements on cotton until something could be done for timber. We preferred a course of action which searched out practical and constructive steps that could be taken to strengthen our domestic timber industry because we are convinced that relief for this industry is needed and the merits of the case are such that it need not be tied to the welfare of any other commodity.

Before this session ends I am certain that we will be seeking to take appropriate action on several recommendations. This is one of them and it is one of the most important.

The Committee on Appropriations has taken another step which is closely linked to this proposal. They have restored a cut of $800,000 in timber sale money made in the House of Representatives. I am convinced that the reasons given in the House report result from an honest misunderstanding. The House reasoned that since there was a drop in the lumber market, the sales in the forthcoming year would not be in such heavy demand. I suspect that this same reasoning led to the conclusion that less funds were needed for access roads.

This is not the case at all. Our lumber industry has plainly indicated that it seeks to have the Forest Service increase its timber sale, increase its allowable cuts, and strive to reduce the costs of national forest stumpage by taking every reasonable and proper step. I, therefore, urge the adoption of this amendment for access roads and hope that the Senate conferees will do their very best to explain to our colleagues in the House why the Senate position should be maintained.

The chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee is a man whose understanding of natural resource problems is great. He is one of the Nation's outstanding conservationists. I am sure that with the facts before him he will understand the great economic importance of this amendment and how it will contribute to the conservation of our natural resources. The national forest timber which is served by these roads is not now available for us. Much of it is rotting on the stump. It is not being conserved. The inability of the Forest Service to sell this timber curtails the capability of the forest products industry to meet Canadian competition. I, therefore, urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Do I correctly understand that my amendment will be the pending business tomorrow, assuming that the Senate adjourns shortly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, tomorrow I intend to call up my amendment on page 18, line 8, before the period, to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to remove any machinery, equipment, or facilities from the oil shale pilot plant at Rifle, Colorado".

I think an explanation of the amendment should appear in the RECORD for today, so that it may be read carefully before the amendment is offered and considered tomorrow.

Mr. President, the total appropriation for "Conservation and development of mineral resources," by the Bureau of Mines proposed by the committee is $26,887,000.

This is an increase of $337,000 over the amount passed by the House.

Part of that $337,000 is $187,000 to expand oil-shale research.

The sponsor of this sum for oil-shale research is the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. It is my assumption, and I think his intention, that most of this sum will be expended in the petroleum research facilities at Laramie, Wyo.

It is my understanding that the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] did not intend, when he offered his amendment in committee, that any of the $187,000 be spent in connection with the pilot oil-shale plant at Rifle, Colo.

The Senator from Wyoming, therefore, advises me that he has no objection to my amendment, which simply provides that the money shall in no way be used to remove any equipment from the Bureau of Mines oil shale experimental plant at Rifle, Colo.

RUMORS OF PLANS TO MOVE RIFLE EQUIPMENT

For some time, Mr. President, we have been hearing rumors of plans within the Bureau of Mines to move out of the rifle plant one of the principal retorts.

The Bureau of Mines declares it has no such intentions, but the stories persist.

My amendment is merely insurance against rumor becoming fact.

In Colorado we are eager to see oil shale research accelerated with all possible speed. Any oil shale research done at Laramie, Wyo., benefits the State of Colorado, since the largest oil shale reserves in the United States are in Colorado.

Thus, Mr. President, I support funds for oil shale research.

I do insist, however, that in the course of this research there be no raid on the facilities already established in Colorado.

We hope soon, Mr. President, to have the Rifle oil shale pilot plant back in full operation. It is now in a standby condition. However, plans are in process right now to restore the plant to operation. These plans will soon be presented to Congress.

HOUSE REJECTED AMENDMENT

Mr. President, in the House of Representatives, on March 20, an amendment was offered to the Interior appropriation bill to add $187,000 for oil shale research.

The amendment proposed in the House was rejected.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement made by Representative WAYNE ASPINALL, in whose district the Rifle plant is located.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. WAYNE ASPINALL

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is untimely. The request of the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior for the additional money is untimely. As I understand the situation the Bureau of Mines has not been able to justify their request for these moneys in their appearance before the Committee on Appropriations.

There is on foot at the present time, and has been for many months a proposed program between the Department of the Navy in the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior. to see whether or not they can arrive at some conclusion as to the operation of the oil-share demonstration plant facility at Rifle, Colo.

As I understand the request for the appropriation of the moneys which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is trying to place in this legislation it will mean the moving of the small retort at Rifle to Laramie. This small retort is very important, as far as the demonstration program is concerned. It is not really a test tube operation. It is an advance beyond the test tube operations which are carried on in the research work at Laramie.

There are many people who live in western Colorado who would like to see this facility reactivated. I would too, privided I thought there was any chance of getting value for the money we spend. However, $187,000 is no amount at all when you consider the approximately $19 million which have been spent on this project with all too few answers found to the problems involved.

I suggest that we defeat this amendment for a most insignificant sum of money, and permit the representatives of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Interior to arrive at their agreement. Then we can present to Congress a proposal for an effective and constructive approach to the whole problem. I feel that when we spend $19 million, or any sizable part of such sum, whether it is in my district, the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or any other district, that we are entiled to get dollar-for-dollar value out of it. We have not got it in this operation, I am sorry to say.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the happy day when we shall start the development of our vast oil shale values. Their wise use has much to offer to our national economy as well as to our national security. They constitute great reservoirs of untold wealth. Further research in laboratories and demonstration plants is vitally needed, and, in my opinion, needed now. But what we need is a real program, not necessarily big for bigness sake, but certainly not so small that its contributions would, without any doubt, be so limited as to be of no real value. Mr. Chairman, I consider that what is proposed in the amendment is of such limited potential that it should not be considered at this time and I ask for the rejection of the amendment.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, following Representative ASPINALL's remarks, the amendment was rejected. I have consulted with Representative ASPINALL concerning my amendment, and he agrees that a provision is necessary in the bill to guard against any attempt to pirate equipment from the Colorado oil shale facility.

Mr. President, at the proper time, I shall urge the adoption of my amendment.

FAVORITISM OR MISMANAGEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, so much attention has been given the Billie Sol Estes case lately that we may overlook the existence of other cases involving either favoritism or mismanagement on the part of the Department of Agriculture.

News accounts have brought out facts developed by investigators of the Billie Sol Estes grain operations; namely, that he received favored treatment in not being required to post an adequate bond for the Government grain stored in his warehouses. The Secretary of Agriculture has given assurance that there will be no loss to the Federal Government as a result of this favoritism. We are pleased to have this assurance, although the matter is yet to be completely investigated, and absence of loss would be purely accidental.

In my own State of Iowa, however, another case—this one involving what I would call incredible mismanagement on the part of the Department of Agriculture—has come to light. An outstanding news story on this case appeared in the Des Moines Sunday Register of June 10, carefully and painstakingly detailing the steps during which an Iowa grain elevator operator literally stole grain right out from under the nose of an Agriculture Department investigator for the Evanston office of the ASC commodity office. The Federal Government claims that the elevator operator owes it $240,000, consisting of $158,000 for 156,785 bushels of stolen corn, plus $67,136 for money already paid for storing and handling the stolen corn. The claim is covered by a $23,000 bond and an $83,000 bond, but the news story reports that there is legal doubt that the $83,000 bond is of the type on which the Government can collect.

From this account it appears that there was inadequate bonding of the elevator operator—not unlike the inadequate bonding in the Billy Sol Estes case. In the news account of the Iowa case,

there is no hint of favoritism; but I believe that the case merits the attention of the McClellan investigating committee.

The taxpayers have a right to know why there was inadequate bonding; and they have a right to know why there was such inexcusable delay—from May 23, when the elevator operator's license was suspended for being 40,000 bushels short, until December 19, 1961—in issuing an order preventing the shipment of grain from the elevator. They have a right to know why the Evanston office on July 14 and 18 ordered shipment of 287,000 bushels of grain from this elevator to be completed by September 6, but none was shipped until August 22. Meanwhile, it appears that Government grain was being stolen by the elevator operator.

Finally, Mr. President, I trust that those responsible for this mismanagement, which has cost the taxpayers so much money, will be removed from the Federal payroll. With the addition of 100,000 more Federal employees to the Federal payroll on the New Frontier, I am confident there will be someone to take over their jobs.

I ask unanimous consent that appropriate excerpts from the Des Moines Register article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOLE CORN AS PROBE WENT ON—GOT 100,000 U.S. BUSHELS OUT OF BINS—BARBOUR'S THEFTS PUT AT $240,818

(By Nick Kotz)

An Iowa grain elevator operator stole more than 100,000 bushels of corn from the U.S. Department of Agriculture after the Federal Government already had started action against him for a smaller grain theft.

Alex V. Barbour, Jr., owner of the Hawkeye Mill at Knoxville, received a 3-year Federal prison sentence in Des Moines last week for theft of 156,785 bushels of Government surplus corn stored in his facilities. The Government loss is $240,818.

What has not been revealed previously is that most of Barbour's grain theft took place in the 6 months (June to December 1961) after—

1. The Iowa Commerce Commission revoked Barbour's warehouse permit for a small grain shortage.

2. The U.S. Agriculture Department had taken Barbour's warehouse off the approved list for storing Federal grain.

3. The U.S. Agriculture Department had called for Barbour to ship to other Federal facilities 287,000 bushels of Federal grain still in his possession.

Barbour shipped the Government only about 132,000 bushels during the 6-month period.

U.S. Department of Agriculture officials and U.S. Attorney Donald Wine acknowledged Saturday that they don't know what Barbour did with about $158,000 of grain stolen after the Agriculture Department investigation began.

Barbour has taken bankruptcy. The bankruptcy proceedings have not shown to date what became of the 151,000 stolen bushels of grain or the money Barbour might have received for the grain.

Agriculture Department officials confirmed in an interview with the Sunday Register that Barbour continued to steal large amounts of Federal grain during a period of several months when Federal investigators actually were in Barbour's warehouse investigating the previous smaller shortage.

Agriculture Department officials reported an increasing shortage to the Evanston, Ill., regional office on several occasions while the investigation was in progress, it was learned.

ONLY 4,000

However, Federal officials did not seal Barbour's warehouse until December 19, 1961, at which time only 4,000 bushels of grain remained in it.

Joseph Haspray, 19-State regional director of the Agriculture Stabilization Conservation Service Commodity Office at Evanston, Ill., was asked in a telephone interview how Barbour stole 100,000 bushels of grain after closing action was started against him for a previous shortage. Haspray said:

"The assumption under our system is that most persons are reasonably honest. Normally when a man gets in a short position, he doesn't continue stealing while you're investigating him. The point is, perhaps, we should have discovered this earlier."

Asked how the shortage could have continued to soar while Agriculture Department investigators were actually on the scene in Knoxville, Haspray said:

"The investigators are not policemen. They are there for the purpose of reviewing the records."

Questioned about what has happened to the missing grain that Barbour sold after the investigation started, Haspray replied:

"I would assume he sold it someplace. There's no way we can trace currency."

This is the chain of events in the State and Federal investigations after discovery of an original shortage in Barbour's grain storage facilities.

May 4, 1961: Wallace Dick, warehouse superintendent for the Iowa Commerce Commission, discovered a 34,000-bushel shortage in a routine check of Barbour's facilities. (The actual shortage could have been about 15,000 bushels greater because the commerce commission gives a generous 10 percent allowance for possible settling of grain in the bins.)

May 16, 1961: Iowa Commerce Commission checkers reported that Barbour was 40,000 bushels short (with the 10 percent allowance) of the 298,000 bushels his warehouse receipts indicated should have been on hand.

May 16: Commerce commission officials notified the Evanston Agriculture Department office of the shortage.

May 23: The Iowa Commerce Commission suspended Barbour's warehouse license pending a formal hearing on revocation of the license.

May 31: The Evanston regional office of the U.S. Agriculture Department issued an order removing Barbour's facilities from approved warehouse list—meaning he could not take in any more Federal grain.

June 6: Vernon Bruce, of Knoxville, regularly employed as a Federal warehouse grain examiner for Iowa by the Evanston office, checked the grain in Barbour's bins. Bruce said he found Barbour 18,950 bushels short of the 297,000 bushels his receipts indicated.

Bruce and Iowa Commerce Commission Official Wallace Dick disagreed at about this time. Dick found a considerably larger shortage than Bruce did.

June 26: Iowa Commerce Commission checkers found Barbour now only 4,595 bushels short. Barbour told them he had purchased 14,000 bushels of grain to cover the previous shortage.

June 30: The Iowa Commerce Commission revoked Barbour's warehouse license. At a hearing 2 days earlier, Barbour told the commission he had replaced 40,000 missing bushels.

July 11: Federal official Haspray said the investigation division of the U.S. Agriculture Department was asked to start investigating Barbour on this date.

July 14 and 18: The Evanston office of the U.S. Agriculture Department ordered Barbour to ship the Federal Government all 287,000 bushels of its grain by September 6.

Agriculture Department records show that Barbour did not ship any grain to the Government until August 22 and shipped 132,725 bushels to the Government between August 22 and December 12 when his grain bins were virtually empty.

Regional Director Haspray said numerous telegrams were sent to Barbour when he did not start fulfilling the shipment orders.

July 1961: Agriculture Department Investigator Alexander M. Gibbon, of the Evanston office, went to Knoxville for several weeks to investigate the Barbour situation.

Gibbon reviewed Barbour's grain liability from January 1, 1961, to July 31, 1961, and in a September 16 report to the Evanston regional office noted that Barbour's shortage had increased to 64,000 bushels by the end of July.

Gibbon also noted that Barbour shipped out 39,000 bushels of grain on his own account (not to the Agriculture Department) during July.

Federal Warehouse Inspector Bruce, of Knoxville, and Iowa officials also acknowledge that Gibbon at this time discovered a 27,000-bushel shortage they had missed. Bruce said this shortage was missed because Barbour had falsely claimed to have shipped the Agriculture Department 27,000 bushels of corn in April when he had not done so.

July 1961: Iowa Commerce Commission official Dick said he made several telephone calls to the Evanston office telling them that the Iowa department was receiving no canceled receipts to indicate Barbour was shipping the Government its corn.

August to December 1961: David Fike, an Agriculture Department investigator for the Evanston office, went to Knoxville to investigate what was happening in the Barbour case.

Fike reported to the Evanston office and eventually to the U.S. attorney in Des Moines that the shortage in Barbour's grain bins was increasing monthly.

Fike's final report, not completed until early in 1962, showed that Barbour's grain storage was about 73,000 bushels at the end of August, 87,000 in September, 700,000 in October, 116,000 in November, and 152,000 by December 16.

October 6, 1961: Knoxville Federal warehouse Examiner Bruce made a physical examination of Barbour's bins on this date. Bruce reported to the Evanston office that Barbour still owed the Federal Government 280,000 bushels of grain but only had 134,000 bushels left in his storage facilities.

Bruce, who is a friend and neighbor of Barbour, said in an interview that it was obvious to him at this time that the shortage was still increasing.

Bruce said his only duty was to report the shortage and not to make any recommendations about action to be taken.

"Maybe we did goof up," commented Bruce, "but you just don't expect things like this to go on."

November 13, 1961: The U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington referred the Barbour case for possible action to U.S. Attorney Roy Meadows in Des Moines. Donald Wine replaced Meadows as U.S. attorney 4 days later.

Late November 1961: Wine said that investigator Fike contacted him for the first time and informed him that Barbour's grain accounts apparently were not balancing.

Mid-December 1961: Wine said that Fike told him at this time it appeared that Barbour was stealing grain "right out from under my nose."

December 19, 1961: U.S. Attorney Wine obtained from Federal District Judge Roy L.

Stephenson a civil restraining order sealing Barbour's storage bins and preventing him from shipping any more grain.

"This civil action was a holding move to stop Barbour from shipping out any more grain, but in a sense it was too late," Wine commented.

It was too late because by December 19, Barbour only had about 4,000 bushels of grain left in his storage facilities.

December 19, 1961: After issuance of the restraining order against him, Barbour filed a voluntary bankruptcy petition in Federal district court here.

Barbour listed debts of $336,722 including $170,000 to the Commodity Credit Corporation for 132,000 bushels of Federal corn. He listed assets of $134,499, consisting mostly of his interest in real estate and farm equipment.

Barbour's interests now are being handled in a Federal bankruptcy receivership action. Up to the present time, the bankruptcy proceedings have not indicated what happened to the 151,000 bushels of stolen corn or the money received for them.

January 3, 1962: Barbour was charged in Federal court with stealing 150,961 bushels (later raised to 156,785) of Federal grain stored in his elevator.

May 7, 1962: Barbour pleaded guilty to a 10-count Federal indictment charging him with stealing 156,785 bushels of corn from the U.S. Government. Of $240,000 the Government wants from Barbour, $158,000 is for stolen grain, and $67,136 is for money already paid to Barbour for storing and handling charges on the stolen grain.

At the time of sentencing, Federal Judge Stephenson asked Barbour what has become of the missing Federal grain or the proceeds from it.

Barbour's attorney replied that the thefts had taken place over a period of 5 years and Barbour now has no money from them.

However, records in the case show clearly that the theft of about 100,000 bushels occurred between June and December 1961, after Barbour's license was revoked and while he was under investigation.

Barbour's creditors, including the Federal Government, have a vested interest in this money, if any of it remains.

LITTLE CHANCE

At present, the Federal officials feel they have little chance of collecting the $240,000 from Barbour.

The Government will try to collect Barbour's two warehouse bonds which are for amounts of $83,000 and $23,000, but there is legal doubt whether the $83,000 bond is of the type the Government can collect a claim on.

Other persons also stand to lose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I compliment the Senator from Iowa for calling this to the attention of the McClellan committee and to the attention of the Senate, and I join in the request that the committee investigate this case along with the Billie Sol Estes case.

I think both the McClellan committee and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should give serious consideration and study to this subject to determine whether the bombing requirements for the storage of such grain are adequate under existing law or whether there is a weakness in the administration of the present law. This makes two instances which have recently been called to our attention wherein the bonding requirements were not adequate. In this particular case, as in the other case, the Department officials who were responsible for this storage paid no attention to the warning they received that the bond was inadequate and that Government grain was being stolen.

I understand that in this instance they were advised that this storage operator was stealing grain but did nothing while another 100,000 bushels were stolen from right under their noses. They paid no attention to the warning they received, and the Department took no steps to protect the Government.

As a former grain dealer I cannot understand how any inspector could let more than 150,000 bushels of grain be stolen right under his nose without knowing it, and certainly a better explanation is in order than that which thus far has been advanced.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

I think a reading of the newspaper account indicates that the attitude of at least one Department of Agriculture official was that after a certain amount of grain had been stolen, he assumed that probably no more would be stolen. The attitude of those officials seemed to be, "We assume that people have a certain amount of honesty in these operations." But, of course, that is the precise reason why we have bonding requirements. We want to be sure to protect the interests of the taxpayers of the United States. Therefore, it is clearly improper to proceed on the basis of an assumption by some official that there is a certain degree of honesty, or on the basis of an assumption by some official that no more stealing will take place. We merely want reasonable protection.

The Senator from Delaware, having once been in the grain business, well knows that if someone had engaged in mismanagement in a private elevator business, he would not be on that elevator's payroll very long.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly not.

In this instance, as I understand it, the Department argued that in the beginning it proceeded on the assumption that everyone was honest. But in this case, the attention of the Department was called to the fact that this particular storage operator was stealing Government grain; and then the Department officials merely sat back and relaxed and said, "Since he knows that we know that he has stolen some of this grain he will not be prone to steal any more, so we can just take our time."

The result was he stole another 100,000 bushels. Secretary Freeman cannot say that the Government in this instance has not lost money, and I venture the opinion that if their own money had been at stake they would not have had that same degree of trust.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

MADISON, WIS., FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on page 19 of the committee report on the pending bill there is a statement that the committee proposes an increase over the House allowance for various projects; and one of the projects, I am very pleased and very grateful to see, is "Preliminary planning and engineering for expansion of Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis., $380,000."

This item was part of the President's budget of last year, and funds for it were approved by the Senate, but were not voted by the House; and, unfortunately, in conference this item was deleted from the bill. I understand this was the only forest research project in last year's budget that was not approved at that time.

So I am very grateful to the committee for including this item, even though the House did not; and I earnestly hope that in the conference the action of the Senate committee will prevail.

This item is of great importance to my State.

Senate approval of the $380,000 appropriation, this afternoon, for the Forest Products Laboratory, to start planning and architectural work, is an important step in the construction of the badly needed addition.

I personally appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee to urge that funds for the new laboratory facilities be provided. I am delighted that the Senate committee agreed with my presentation and voted to provide the necessary funds. And I am even more gratified that the Senate this afternoon gave the project its OK.

Regrettably, no funds for the Forest Products Laboratory addition are provided in the House version of this appropriations bill. I hope that in the House-Senate conference that will take place in the near future, the Senate action will prevail. I intend to do all I can to insure this result.

The University of Wisconsin and the Wisconsin Legislature have already approved the sale of land to the laboratory for the proposed addition.

Failure to provide the needed funds now will prevent the planned orderly expansion of the laboratory on the basis of which this land transfer was approved.

PROPOSED ELIMINATION FROM DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL OF ITEM FOR "FORRESTAL" CLASS AIRCRAFT CARRIER, AND PROPOSED REDUCTION OF FUNDS FOR B–70 MANNED-BOMBER PROGRAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit two amendments to the Defense

June 12, 1962

not inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans. Requires that not more than 10 percent of the amounts allocated shall be available for public works within any one State.

6. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Bolton criticized the farm bill. p. 9435
Rep. Harsha criticized the farm bill, saying, "The farm bill in its present form is the most ominous power grab ever devised. This bill will destroy the last vestige of free enterprise among farmers, it is a nightmare of increased controls, costs and regimentation." pp. 9438-9

7. LUMBER. Rep. O'Hara, Ill., discussed the condition of the walnut veneer industry, saying, "Countries abroad, short of hardwood which they have squandered on their own soil, are buying increasing quantities of black walnut veneer logs in this country, driving up the price to astronomical figures and threatening the very existence of our domestic industry." He urged export controls that "would help promote the domestic economy and would not injure our foreign trade policies." pp. 9446-8

8. TEXTILES. Rep. Jonas discussed the plight of the domestic textile industry and said, "I respectfully request prompt action on the part of our Government to take such steps as may be necessary to halt this tremendously increasing flow of textile products into this country." pp. 9448-9

9. APPROPRIATIONS. Received from the President "amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1963 involving a net decrease in the amount of $16,700,000 for the Agency for International Development" (H. Doc. 430). p. 9450

10. FOREIGN TRADE. The Ways and Means Committee reported with amendments H. R. 11970, the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (H. Rept. 1818). p. 9451

11. ATOMIC ENERGY. The "Daily Digest" states that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy "in executive session, ordered favorably reported to the Senate and House, respectively, clean bills embodying amended versions of S. 3292 and H. R. 11733, fiscal 1963 authorizations for the Atomic Energy Commission." p. D462

12. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that H. R. 11990, the temporary increase in the public debt, will be considered on Wed., June 13. pp. 9434-5

SENATE

13. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 10802 (pp. 9484-90, 9498-9523, 9524-32). Conferees were appointed (p. 9532).
Agreed to the following amendments:
By Sen. Magnuson, by a vote of 47 to 41, to increase from $2 million to $6 million the amount for acquiring by condemnation or otherwise additional roads needed for access to national forest lands, to remain available until expended. pp. 9484-90, 9498-9507
By Sen. Magnuson, by a vote of 49 to 40, to strike from his amendment above the terms "acquiring by condemnation or otherwise" and "to remain available until expended" (pp. 9508-9). Earlier a point of order was sustained against a motion by Sen. Magnuson to strike this language (pp. 9507-8).
Rejected, by a vote of 26 to 60, a motion by Sen Dirksen to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to report it back to the Senate in a total amount for all purposes and items which shall not exceed the sum of $868,595,000. Sen. Dirksen explained that his proposal would have cut the proposed appropriation by $48 million. pp. 9524-9

14. FORESTRY. Sen. Neuberger discussed Forest Service timber sales policies and inserted Secretary Freeman's reply to proposals by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association for modificattions in Forest Service timber sales policies and procedures, timber rates, appeals from adverse decisions of the Forest Service, and the present timber sales contract form. pp. 9456-9

15. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses received from the President the final annual report on the operations of the mutual security program for the period ending June 30, 1961 (H. Doc. 432). pp. 9401, 9453

16. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Morse inserted an article by Dr. Cochrane in the USDA Employee News Bulletin presenting in "capsule form, the philosophy of the Kennedy farm program." p. 9473

Sen. Morse inserted a farmer's letter urging him to support the Administration's farm legislation and stating that "this legislation will do more to solve the problem and is the most effective method yet proposed for that purpose." p. 9473

Sen. Lausche inserted a farmer's letter criticizing the Administration's farm program and stating that payments he received for taking land out of production were more than the land originally cost. p. 9482

17. SOIL CONSERVATION. Sen. Morse inserted a National Association of Soil Conservation Districts resolution commending SCS Administrator Williams for his administration of the soil and water conservation programs. pp. 9473-4

18. RECLAMATION. Sen. Proxmire spoke in opposition to the proposed Glen Elder dam and irrigation project in Kan., and inserted several letters supporting his position. pp. 9460-2

19. EDUCATION. Sen. Morse inserted Sen. Benton's speech before the United Parents Association on current problems in educational research. pp. 9476-8

20. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. This bill, H. R. 11289, was made the unfinished business. p. 9533

21. SOLAR ENERGY. Sen. Humphrey urged creation of an Office of Solar Energy within the Department of the Interior. p. 9533

22. DRUGS; RESEARCH. Sen. Kefauver inserted an analysis of amendments being considered by the Judiciary Committee to S. 1552, to amend the antitrust laws with respect to the manufacture and distribution of drugs. pp. 9533-5

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

23. TRANSPORTATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Younger inserting an address urging enactment of legislation to aid transportation problems. pp. A4288-90

24. RECREATION; LANDS. Extension of remarks of Sen. Williams, N. J., stressing the importance of keeping publicly owned land from the "blight of unplanned urban sprawl." p. A4290

25. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Sen. Wiley discussing the progress of major legislation in Congress and stating that "...the outlook is not only for longer than usual, but also an extraordinarily busy session of Congress." p. A4294

26. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Cunningham inserting a statement made by Dr. Ralph following his appearance before the House Government Operations Committee regarding his relationship with Billie Sol Estes. pp. A4295-6

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGR'CULTURE
LAW LIBRARY
LEGISLATIVE REPORTING

87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10802

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 12, 1962

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, (1)~~$39,375,000~~ *$43,022,200.*

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of access roads, acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads (other than on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands), and acquisition and construction of buildings and appurtenant facilities, $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such lands; an amount equivalent to 25 per centum of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from

the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the amount appropriated herein for the purposes of this appropriation on lands administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture: *Provided further,* That the amount appropriated herein for road construction on lands other than those administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further,* That the amount appropriated herein is hereby made a reimbursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase of nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft; purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures; and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Provided,* That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and re-

conveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands (other than expenditures made under the appropriation "Oregon and California grant lands") shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in subsection (c), title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876), of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California land-grant fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 754), of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund": *Provided further*, That appropriations herein made may be expended on a reimbursable basis for (1) surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and (2) protection and leasing of lands and mineral resources for the State of Alaska.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, as range improvements fees under section 3 of said Act, 25 per centum of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of said Act, and the amount designated for range improvements from

grazing fees from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive Order 10787, dated November 6, 1958, to remain available until expended.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

education and welfare services

For expenses necessary to provide education and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission), of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; **(**2**)**~~$81,000,000~~ *$82,827,000.*

resources management

For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian

arts and crafts as authorized by law; (3)~~$34,300,000~~ *$34,677,000.*

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

For payment to the revolving fund for loans, as authorized by section 10 of the Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (25 U.S.C. 470), $4,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; (4)~~$52,000,000~~ *$55,550,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section

203, and the Act of August 23, 1958 (72 Stat. 834), (5)~~$16,000,000~~ *$17,000,000*, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices, (6)~~$4,000,000~~ *$4,350,000*.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for expenses of exhibits; purchase of not to exceed two hundred and (7)~~twenty~~ *thirty* passenger motor vehicles (including (8)~~fifty~~ *seventy-one* for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year), of which two hundred shall be for replacement only, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; advance payments for service (including services which may extend beyond the current fiscal year) under contracts executed pursuant to the Act of June 4, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 452), the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), and legislation terminating Federal supervision over certain Indian tribes; purchase of ice for official use of employees; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated $3,000,000 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition, and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission); purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel, and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a curator for the Osage Museum, who shall be appointed with the approval of the Osage Tribal Council and without

regard to the classification laws: *Provided,* That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the (9)*Secretary, except that judgment funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission or the Court of Claims and the interest thereon may not be advanced to the tribes until a report of the purposes for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and both committees have approved the advance by committee resolution or neither committee has disapproved the advance by committee resolution within sixty calendar days from the date the report is submitted to the committees, not counting days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain: Provided however,* That no part of this appropriation or other tribal funds shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reserva-

tions, if such acquisition results in the property being exempted from local taxation, except as provided for by the Act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 627).

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For expenses necessary for the management and protection of the areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service, including protection of lands in process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail plans and working drawings) and archeological values in river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin); (10) ~~$25,425,000~~ *$26,034,320.*

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service, $20,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451), of buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities under the

jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including the White House; the repair or replacement of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, or storm, or the construction of projects deferred by reason of the use of funds for such purposes; the acquisition of water rights; and not to exceed (11)~~$8,409,000~~ *$11,635,000* for the acquisition of lands, interest therein, improvements, and related property; (12) ~~$40,000,000~~ *$44,526,000* to remain available until expended(13)*: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the condemnation of any land for Grand Teton National Park in the State of Wyoming.*

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, $29,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That none of the funds herein provided shall be expended for planning or construction on the following: Fort Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, except minor roads and trails; Great Falls Park, Virginia; Daingerfield Island Marina, Virginia; and extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the National Park Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, (14)~~$1,900,000~~ *$1,964,000.*

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and (15)~~thirty-five~~ *fifty-two* passenger motor vehicles (of which one hundred and twenty-five are for replacement only), including not to exceed (16)~~fifty~~ *fifty-seven* for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and the objects and purposes specified in the Acts of August 8, 1953 (16 U.S.C. 1b–1d), and July 1, 1955 (16 U.S.C. 18f).

Office of Territories

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and for the departmental administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C., secs. 1422, 1431a(c)); salaries of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secretary, the Government Comptroller, and the members of their immediate staffs as authorized by law (48

U.S.C. 1591, 72 Stat. 1095) ; compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. secs. 1421d(e), 1431a(c), and 1572e) ; compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1431a(c)) ; grants to American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the houses of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa; $13,768,000: *Provided,* That the Territorial and local governments herein provided for are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further,* That appropriations available for the administration of Territories may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

For expenses necessary for the Department of the Interior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by joint resolution of July 18, 1947 (61 Stat. 397), and the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), including the expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory

of the Pacific Islands; compensation and expenses of the Judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of governmental functions; $6,600,000: *Provided,* That the revolving fund for loans to locally owned private trading enterprises shall continue to be available during the fiscal year 1963: *Provided further,* That all financial transactions of the Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 834): *Provided further,* That the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further,* That appropriations available for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of article 6(2) of the Trusteeship Agreement approved by Congress: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding the provisions of

any law, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to receive, during the current fiscal year, from the Department of Agriculture for distribution on the same basis as domestic distribution in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, without exchange of funds, such surplus food commodities as may be available pursuant to section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c) and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1431).

Alaska Railroad

ALASKA RAILROAD REVOLVING FUND

The Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall continue available until expended for the work authorized by law, including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit and development of industries or travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916 (5 U.S.C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided: *Provided,* That no employee shall be paid an annual salary out of said fund in excess of the salaries prescribed by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS–15, except the general

manager of said railroad, one assistant general manager at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for GS–17, and five officers at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for grade GS–16.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Geological Survey

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by law (72 Stat. 837); (17) *conduct investigations of marine geology and hydrology;* classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; control the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U.S.C. 715); and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; (18) ~~$56,100,000~~ *$56,900,000*, of which $8,430,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more

than one-half the cost of any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed forty-nine passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; purchase of not to exceed one aircraft for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations and observation wells; expenses of U.S. National Committee on Geology and payment of contributions to the International Union on Geologic Sciences; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts.

Bureau of Mines

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; and developing synthetics and substitutes; (19)~~$26,550,000~~ *$26,887,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to remove any machinery, equipment, or facilities from the oil shale pilot plant at Rifle, Colorado.*

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries, and controlling fires in coal deposits, as authorized by law, $8,158,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For the construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, $425,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional offices, $1,333,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; providing transportation services in isolated areas for employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils, and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrangements; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Provided,* That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided further,* That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HELIUM PROPERTIES

The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treasury for payment to the helium production fund pursuant to section 12 (a) of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960 to carry

out the provisions of the Act and contractual obligations thereunder, including helium purchases, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, (20)~~$6,000,000~~ *$20,000,000*, in addition to amounts heretofore authorized to be borrowed.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development, as authorized by law (74 Stat. 337), (21)~~$2,000,000~~ *$3,450,000*, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $300,000 shall be available for administration and supervision.

OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to provide a program for the discovery of the minerals reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions, by encouraging exploration for minerals, including administration of contracts entered into prior to June 30, 1958, under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, (22)~~$750,000~~ *$875,000*, including not to exceed $213,600 for administrative and technical services, to remain available until expended.

LEAD AND ZINC STABILIZATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out a lead and zinc mining stabilization program, including payments to producers, as authorized by the Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766), $2,450,000.

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities with respect to oil and gas, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and its products, and natural gas, $531,000.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Commissioner, $364,000.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including

whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such resources; promotion of education and training of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions related thereto, as authorized by law; (23)~~$14,600,000~~ *$15,981,500.*

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

(SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104 (k) of that Act, $300,000, which shall be available to purchase only those currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required for the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, (24)~~$7,900,000~~ *$8,473,000*, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86–516, to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, $750,000.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, including such expenses in the regional offices, $600,000.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a–631q), there are appropriated amounts not to exceed $1,998,000, to be derived from Pribilof Islands fund.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FISHERIES LOAN FUND

During the current fiscal year not to exceed $250,000 of the Fisheries loan fund shall be available for administrative expenses.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and

utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and functions related to wildlife management in California (16 U.S.C. 695–695c); and leasing and management of lands for the protection of the Florida Key deer; (25)~~$26,500,000~~ *$27,436,000.*

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein (26)*(including improvements of the county road from Brigham City, Utah, to the headquarters Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge)*, (27)~~$4,900,000~~ *$8,033,800*, to remain available until expended.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

For an advance to the Migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, including such expenses in the regional offices, (28)~~$1,250,000~~ *$1,331,000.*

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred and (29)~~seventeen~~ *twenty-four* passenger motor vehicles of which ninety-two shall be for replacement only (including fifty for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year); purchase of not to exceed two aircraft; not to exceed $30,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417); rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed $3 per man per day; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed $1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are not

inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951–1958), authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, to remain available until expended, (30)~~$7,600,000~~ *$7,700,000*, of which not to exceed (31) ~~$525,000~~ *$625,000* shall be available for administration and coordination during the current fiscal year.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of demonstration plants for the production of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, as authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958a–1958g), (32)~~$2,000,000~~ *$2,085,000*, of which not to exceed (33)~~$175,000~~ *$225,000* shall be available for administration.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, (34)~~$3,600,000~~ *$3,747,000*, and in addition, not to exceed $130,000 may be reimbursed or transferred to this appropriation from other accounts available to the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That hearing officers appointed for Indian probate work need not be appointed pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), as amended.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), including teletype rentals and service, not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, and purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (medium sedan at not to exceed $3,000) for replacement only, (35)~~$3,350,000~~ *$3,340,000*.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged

or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided,* That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: *Provided,* That appropriations made in this title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft or other equipment in connection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activ-

ity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided,* That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title or in the Public Works Appropriations Act, 1963 shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), when authorized by the Secretary, at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, and in total amount not to exceed $175,000; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131 and D.C. Code 4–204).

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

forest protection and utilization

For expenses necessary for forest protection and utilization, as follows:

Forest land management: For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, including the administration, improvement, development, and management of lands under Forest Service administration, fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening such lands and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purposes, control of white pine blister rust and other forest diseases and insects on Federal and non-Federal lands; (36)~~$138,400,000~~ *$141,045,000*, of which $5,000,000 for fighting and preventing forest fires and $1,910,000 for insect and disease control shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to the extent necessary under the then existing conditions: *Provided*, That not more than (37)~~$300,000~~ *$805,000* may be used for acquisition of land under the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513–519): *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for "Cooperative range improvements", pursuant to section 12 of the Act of

April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), may be advanced to this appropriation.

Forest research: For forest research at forest and range experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, as authorized by law; (38) ~~$22,975,000~~ *$25,865,000*.

State and private forestry cooperation: For cooperation with States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in forest tree planting on non-Federal public and private lands, and in forest management and processing, and for advising timberland owners, associations, wood-using industries, and others in the application of forest management principles and processing of forest products, as authorized by law; (39) ~~$15,800,000~~ *$16,405,000*.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, sections 203 and 205, relating to the construction and maintenance of forest development roads and trails, $37,500,000, to remain available until expended, for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203: *Provided,* That funds available under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), shall be merged with and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided further,*

That not less than the amount made available under the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913, shall be expended under the provisions of such Act.

(40) *ACCESS ROADS*

For additional roads needed for access to national forest lands in carrying out the Act of June 4, 1897, as amended (16 U.S.C. 471, 472, 475, 476, 551), $6,000,000.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

For completion of the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 570; 16 U.S.C. 577c–h), as amended, by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be available without regard to the restriction in the proviso in section 1 of that Act.

SPECIAL ACTS

For the acquisition of land in the Cache National Forest, Utah, in accordance with the Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), as amended, $10,000, to be derived from forest receipts as authorized by said Act: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall

be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned.

(41)*For acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), as amended, authorizing annual appropriation of forest receipts for such purposes, from such receipts, $20,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of the national forest.*

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests in accordance with section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), to be derived from grazing fees as authorized by said section, $700,000, to remain available until expended.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16 U.S.C. 568e), (42)~~$1,000,000~~ *$1,500,000*, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations available to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to exceed one hundred and (43)~~fifty-two~~ *seventy-nine* passenger motor vehicles, of which one hundred and thirty-seven shall be for replacement only, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three of which one shall be for replacement only; (b) employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not to exceed $25,000; (c) uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); (d) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (5 U.S.C. 565a); (e) expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 514); and (f) acquisition of land and interests therein for sites for administrative purposes, pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a).

Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated to the

Forest Service shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

Funds appropriated under this Act shall not be used for acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513–519, 521), where such land is not within the boundaries of a national forest nor shall these lands or lands authorized for purchase in Sanders County, Montana, be acquired without approval of the local government concerned.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $70,000.

Commission of Fine Arts

salaries and expenses

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), including payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and Committee meetings of the Commission either within or outside the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the Commission, (44) ~~$70,000~~ *$80,000*.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), as amended; purchase of not to exceed twenty-six passenger motor vehicles, of which nineteen shall be for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary: and the purposes set forth in sections 301 (with respect to research conducted at facilities financed by this appropriation), 321, 322 (d), 324, and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; (45) ~~$55,284,000~~ *$57,000,000.*

CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable buildings; purchase of trailers; and provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42

U.S.C. 2004a); ~~(46) $8,320,000~~ *$9,335,000*, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public and for payment in advance for publications available only upon that basis or available at a reduced price on prepublication orders.

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or

which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U.S.C. 70), creating an Indian Claims Commission, $290,000, of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for expenses of travel.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71–71i), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $625,000.

LAND ACQUISITION, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK, PARKWAY, AND PLAYGROUND SYSTEM

For necessary expenses for the National Capital Planning Commission for acquisition of land for the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital, as authorized by the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended, to remain available until expended, $100,000 which shall be available for the purpose of section 1(a) thereof: *Provided*, That not exceeding $50,000 of the funds available for land acquisition purposes shall be used during

the current fiscal year for necessary expenses of the Commission (other than payments for land) in connection with land acquisition.

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title II of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537), including payment in advance for membership in societies whose publications or services are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); (47) ~~$3,350,000~~ *$2,825,000.*

LAND ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for the National Capital Transportation Agency for acquisition of land for extra-wide median strips, or interests therein, and for incidental construction, for transit facilities, as authorized by law, $400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That such land purchases shall be subject to the advance approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and

exploring expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches among the American Indians and the natives of lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United States, independently or in cooperation with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States, and the excavation and preservation of archeological remains; for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; for the administration, construction, and maintenance of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, Canal Zone, under the provisions of the Act of July 2, 1940, as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and administration of a national air museum as authorized by the Act of August 12, 1946 (20 U.S.C. 77); for expenses of the National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board; including not to exceed $35,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), for other employees; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and

preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications; $10,900,000.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

For necessary expenses of planning, construction, remodeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the National Zoological Park, $1,275,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such portion of this amount as may be necessary may be transferred to the District of Columbia (20 U.S.C. 81–84; 75 Stat. 779).

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

For the upkeep and operation of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators and uniforms, or allowances therefor for other employees as

authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and not to exceed $15,000 for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper; $2,054,000.

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

For grants to the State of Alaska to assist in accomplishing an orderly transition from Territorial status to statehood and to facilitate the assumption of responsibilities hitherto performed in Alaska by the Federal Government, and for expenses of providing Federal services or facilities in Alaska for an interim period, as authorized by law (73 Stat. 151), $3,000,000.

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), as amended (72 Stat. 1769), $100,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, RELATED AGENCIES

The per diem rate, unless an agency is otherwise limited by law to payment of a lesser per diem, paid from appropria-

tions made available under this title for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), shall not exceed $75.

TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Revolving Fund

For an additional amount for the revolving fund established under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, for advances to the Virgin Islands Corporation, as authorized by law (63 Stat. 350; 72 Stat. 1760), $200,000.

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation

During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to it and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its programs as set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That not to exceed $180,000 shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the Corpora-

tion, covering the categories set forth in the 1963 budget estimates for such expenses.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963."

Passed the House of Representatives March 20, 1962.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments June 12, 1962.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10802

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 12, 1962

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

pansive research program encompassing the huge area of the northern Pacific Ocean, including Bering Sea, has been carried on, inspired by two features of the treaty. One was to prove whether the United States and Canada were themselves complying with the conservation requirements for continued abstention by Japan. The other was to show whether the provisional line specified in the treaty protocol (175° W.), east of which the Japanese would abstain from fishing salmon, should be shifted.

THE ROVING SALMON

The line was originally assumed to divide American from Asiatic salmon. Research disclosed that the Bristol Bay red salmon did not have the sagacity to stay home on their own side of the ocean, but were enticed by apparently green pastures to the westward so that at certain stages of their life practically all of them could be intercepted by the Japanese west of the provisional line. In fact, there were found to be some areas west of the line where practically all the red salmon were of Alaskan origin at certain times, and under United States interpretation of the treaty, were entitled to protection. On the other hand, in alternate years Siberian pink salmon seemed to hanker for the flavor of American waters east of the line; but these are not caught by American fishermen, who, unlike the Japanese, are not operative far offshore.

Affirmative action by the commission requires unanimity, but on the one hand the United States has not succeeded in having the line shifted westward, and on the other hand the Japanese are still obligated to abstain from American salmon and halibut. The Tripartite Treaty may continue indefinitely, but it may be terminated in June, 1963, or thereafter, by any party giving a year's notice.

The North Pacific picture has changed radically in the last few years. The intensive trawling in Bering Sea not only threatens the halibut stock there, but may even be excessive as to other ground fish, and if extended into the Gulf of Alaska it may imperil the work of both the Halibut and Salmon Commissions despite the inspiring example of successful international cooperation they have set before the world.

So far the Russians have not sought American salmon, but they now have a salmon treaty with Japan which not only results in reducing the Japanese catch of Siberian salmon, but naturally increases their longing for American salmon. Whether the Japanese will consider it desirable to terminate the Tripartite Treaty is an open question. There are arguments both ways.

The Geneva Conferences of 1958 and 1960 on the "Law of the Sea" by no means solved the problems of the North Pacific. The members of the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission from all three nations are striving diligently to find answers, but the future is guesswork. There is at least one assertion which can be made with confidence—the present North Pacific fishery situation is one of increasingly precarious perplexities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Alaska.

I wish to repeat what we stated yesterday. When my colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] was a Delegate in the House of Representatives from Alaska, before Alaska became a State, he and I and the late distinguished Richard Neuberger, husband of the present occupant of the chair, along with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators, tried for many years to convince the State Department of the fact that fisheries are an important economic segment of the United States and therefore ought to be considered on a policy level in the State Department. We never could get that result, though Mr. Lovett at one time elevated the consideration of the problem.

I have known of international conferences on trade, some of the GATT agreements, and some of the other agreements the United States enters into, which spend 3 or 4 weeks talking about machine tools, automobiles, grain—and perhaps rightly so—and, when the conference members are at the point of preparing to go home, finishing negotiations, somebody will present for consideration the problem of international fisheries. This is the way we have been negotiating our fisheries agreements. It happens because, at the policy level in the State Department, there is no one who can stand up and talk about the problem.

What happens? When one goes to an international fisheries conference one sees someone from the Fish and Wildlife Service, or perhaps someone under a subhead of a subdepartment of the State Department, who sits across the table from cabinet ministers, to do the negotiating. He has two strikes against him before he starts. This is what the Senator from Alaska and I are talking about this morning.

I hope the State Department will read the colloquy. We have talked about this problem for many years, yet we seem unable to make any progress in respect to it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I could not agree more absolutely with the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish the Vice President could be doing the negotiating on our side.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am glad the Vice President is still in the Chamber, to listen to this discussion, which I know is of great interest to him.

Men like Donald L. McKernan, the Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and William C. Herrington, special assistant to the Under Secretary for Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of State, are knowledgeable and well informed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But they have no authority.

Mr. BARTLETT. They have no authority. They have no policymaking authority whatsoever.

I know the Senator will agree with me when I say that if Governor Egan, of Alaska, had not acted promptly, affirmatively, and decisively the other day when the Japanese fishing fleet started to fish in the coastal waters of Alaska, probably many more Japanese fishing vessels would be there today, fishing the resources which are Alaskan in origin and upon which the fishermen from the State of Oregon, and from the State of Washington, as well as Alaskans, have customarily depended for a considerable amount of their livelihood. We must protect the fishery or a great industry will be lost and a hardship will be brought to many people.

KEEPING THE ECONOMY MOVING

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, previously I presented the Senate the fact that some businessmen blame the recent stock market break on high taxes, an unbalanced budget, Government intervention in the steel industry, and the influence of large unions.

But in 1929 the budget was balanced, taxes were low, there was no Government intervention, and there were no large unions. Nevertheless the stock market break was far more severe and far more serious.

Rather than allocate responsibility, it seems to me we should now be considering positive and constructive action. In that connection I refer to a thought-provoking article by Mr. Walter Lippmann, one of the wiser men of this Nation, entitled, "To Get the Economy Moving."

In the article Mr. Lippmann said:

> It is no explanation of the situation to say that businessmen do not like Kennedy and the Democrats and are therefore afraid to invest. They did not like Truman in 1950 but they did invest. They liked and trusted Eisenhower in 1960 but they did not do anything to save the 1960 Eisenhower recovery from being aborted. The truth is that the great movements of the business cycle are not caused by incidents, personalities, or political parties, but by continental and global tides of supply and demand.

Recently the Secretary of the Treasury delivered an address in which he suggested a tax reduction next year.

Mr. Lippman's article reminds one of a famous American slogan: "Eventually—Why Not Now?"

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "To Get the Economy Moving," published in the Herald Tribune this morning, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO GET THE ECONOMY MOVING

(By Walter Lippmann)

While there is wide agreement that a tax cut is needed, there is an important difference of opinion on when it should be put into effect. The administration's position is that a tax cut should be voted in the next session of Congress, if possible early in 1963. If this is done, the effects of the cut will not at best be felt until some 10 months from now.

There are others who think that it is imprudent to wait so long, that what the economy needs is the stimulation of additional demand in the near future. This could be had by action in this session of Congress to cut by a few percentage points the withholding from payrolls for taxes, as well as the installment payments in September and January for incomes and corporations. Eighty percent of personal income tax is paid in the form of withheld wages and salaries. The economic effect of an income tax cut on income and spending would be felt by the beginning of the month after it was enacted.

The argument for waiting until next year rests on the idea that if taxes are cut before the tax structure is reformed (as proposed by the administration), Congress is likely to lose interest in tax reform. The administration's current view is that for the long run tax reform is very important and that it should not be sidetracked by the popularity of a tax cut. On the contrary, the unpop-

clar features of tax reform should be made more palatable by the tax cut.

This may be a correct estimate of congressional psychology. The question is whether the prospects of the economy today do not require a decision to stimulate and prolong the recovery and avert a recession. Tax reform may be more difficult if the recovery is promoted and sustained by a tax cut. But everything will be more difficult if the recovery is aborted before it has been achieved.

There is ground for thinking that the underlying trend is not toward a full recovery. I myself believe that this is the determining cause of the bear market in stocks which has been in existence since December. It is true that consumer buying is good, including automobiles and houses, but against this we find that inventories are being kept extremely low, that while hours of work have been steady, unemployment remains high.

Most disturbing and most significant is the fact that plans to purchase plant and equipment—which is the backbone of full employment and a high rate of growth—are disappointingly small. Early in January the administration was hoping for a rise of 1½ percent above the 1961 capital investment level. Today, the figures for May show that current business plans indicate a rise of only about 8 percent, which is no more than it was back in February. If this continues, the chances are that the Kennedy recovery, like the Eisenhower recovery of 1960, will grind to a halt.

It is no explanation of the situation to say that businessmen do not like Kennedy and the Democrats, and are therefore afraid to invest. They did not like Truman in 1950 but they did invest. They liked and trusted Eisenhower in 1960, but they did not do anything to save the 1960 Eisenhower recovery from being aborted. The truth is that the great movements of the business cycle are not caused by incidents, personalities, or political parties, but by continental and global tides of supply and demand.

It is no accident that the Kennedy recovery of 1962 has become throttled down as the true budget of income and product accounts has been coming into balance. The truth is that the American economy, far from being inflationary, is in fact being pressed down by strong deflationary pressure. Many do not see this because they are confused by the administrative budget which does not tell the true story. In that budget there is a deficit. But in the really significant budget—the income accounts—there is a premature balance acheived before recovery has been completde. In an economy with large unemployment and low utilization of plant capacity this balance of the income accounts is deflationary.

The reason why a tax cut is desirable is that it will relieve the deflationary pressure.

It is to the problem of our throttled recovery that the administration ought, I think, to address itself primarily. I do not say that tax reform is not important and desirable. But recovery is more important and recovery should not be jeopardized by the legislative prospects for tax reform.

As for the reforms themselves, I must confess at once that I do not understand the proposals well enough yet to write about them at all. I feel reasonably certain, however, that the controversial items which are holding up the 1962 tax reform bill are not big enough to be of such crucial importance that they must have first priority.

The President's first priority is to get the economy moving.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to strike out, on page 31, line 12, the figure "$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$6,000,000".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I wish to address myself to a problem which involves the amendment now pending with relation to access roads. I wish also to invite the attention of Senators to a subject which is directly involved in the problem of stumpage and forest timber sales.

When the committee was considering the bill, I, along with my colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], asked that the Forest Service supply certain information for the committee. The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] joined in the request. The material is available in the hearing record starting at page 1102. It shows that there is room for substantial improvement.

At a hearing held in Portland, Oreg., last week by the Committee on Commerce there was discussion of the Forest Service timber sales program. The senior Senator from Oregon was present. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the present occupant of the chair, was vitally interested, and sent certain information to the committee. In the hearing it was suggested that the problem be discussed on the floor during the consideration of the appropriation of funds for the Forest Service. I agreed, because there is no doubt that the lumber industry is experiencing great difficulties in competition with the Canadians. We in the Pacific Northwest area know of that competition. One of the factors is the national forest timber availability.

Our first point of interest was whether the timber sale performance matched the basis on which funds were appropriated. It definitely does not.

In fiscal year 1961 there was a terrible fall down in national forest timber sale performance. Only 77 percent of the timber offered for sale was sold. In the region represented by the Senators from California only 62 percent of financed timber was sold. In the Idaho-Montana region it was 79 percent. In the Oregon-Washington region 82 percent was sold. In the Rocky Mountain region—Colorado, South Dakota, and Wyoming—only 44 percent of the timber financed for sale was sold; and in Alaska a mere 31 percent was sold. The Lake States region—Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, and so forth—shows a record of only 64 percent sold. The record in previous years has sometimes been better and sometimes worse. It is a very spotty record. It must be improved starting right now.

Over the years we have been very considerate of the needs of the Forest Service. We have continually granted budget requests and we have added funds on occasion. I do not regret that we have done this. There may be some extenuating circumstances but I am interested in results not excuses. I think the Forest Service can improve and my remarks today are intended to see that they do so.

The point I want to make perfectly clear on the record is that the Forest Service has an obligation to offer for sale the full amount of timber that the budget plans will be sold. If circumstances come up where this is not practical or possible we should be advised.

From here on out it should be crystal clear that the timber sale business involves a direct obligation on the part of the Forest Service. Timber sales plans should be made early and available for local mills to plan on. The industry should be able to count on the fact that 99 times out of 100 a timber sale that is planned will be made when it was planned and in the approximate volume planned. If some hitch develops, a substitute sale should be ready.

The Forest Service must arrange its affairs so that these sales are made with clocklike regularity.

This is a $100 million business. It must be operated like a business and a business run on humane standards. Efficiency must become a watchword but I do not want to suggest that I am urging that the Forest Service develop a cold, impersonal, business machine operated like a coffee vending machine. What is needed is performance according to plans and plans that are based on doing the utmost to sell all of the timber permissible under sustained yield rules. We have communities and payrolls dependent upon this timber. Their legitimate needs must be met.

The second thing that must be done is to modernize the allowable cuts. If more timber can be properly added to allowable cuts this must be done and done promptly. If there are reasons why the allowable cut cannot be increased, then we and the local people should know those reasons. In some cases allowable cuts are held back because lands burned in the past decades have still not been reforested. If this is the case—the funds should be sought. In other cases the full allowable cut cannot be reached because of a lack of roads or road use. I shall offer an amendment to take care of some of these road problems. I should not have to do this—the budget requests should clearly set forth these fund needs.

If rotation ages can be reduced—or there is a change in log utilization standards—the allowable cuts should reflect these factors.

I want to make it perfectly clear that I do not propose that the Forest Serv-

ice figure out how to log the wilderness areas. On the presently commercial forest land outside of wilderness, there is plenty of ability to grow timber without trespassing on the little timber that is today in wilderness and limited areas.

To accomplish these two basic suggestions there are several things that must be done. First, the Chief of the Forest Service must take a good hard look at procedures presently being followed and institute the necessary reforms.

Second, the people concerned with developing the budget in the Department and the Budget Bureau as well as in the Congress need to have better working tools.

This can be accomplished by making annual reports more than historical documents—by converting them to working tools. Efficient management requires that executive levels be on top of developments. They need to know early what is happening and at the same time, the operating levels need to know the level of performance expected.

The forest industry suggested to Secretary Freeman some information that they think is important. Their suggestions may be good but they do not cover the salient points on performance. When the Forest Service appears before our committee next year they should have in our hands—as of January 15—a report on business for both the first and the second half of calendar year 1962. We should know by Forest Service regions—or States such as Washington and Oregon—where the sale business large, the relation between what the agency was financed to do, and thus planned to do, and what they accomplished. Even more important, we should know what the problems of management are and how they are to be overcome.

In short, we should have a meaningful annual report placed before the Congress each January 15 that can be used as an adjunct to the budget process. I suggest that this first year the effort be concentrated on the timber sale and allowable cut business. We can then see how this goes and extend the application to grazing, to recreation and other programs.

Therefore, I want the record to show that this is what we expect and this constitutes a condition upon which funds are appropriated.

Finally, the agency has the power to transfer funds. In order to bring all possible relief to the timber industry from short timber supplies, the Forest Service should be prepared to transfer funds from programs with less immediate economic importance to timber activities.

I intended to propose an amendment which would add to the research work of the Forest Service, and add a small laboratory for timber management and animal damage prevention research. The subject was discussed in committee. I think the foundation is laid for sympathetic consideration of the entire subject of animal damage to young forests. I need not suggest to anyone from our area how serious the problem is.

The laboratory is needed to permit progress of research on the management of young-growth Douglas-fir stands and on the prevention and control of animal damage to these young forests. As more and more of the old-growth timber is removed, more of the cut must come from the young-growth stands. In 1960 about one-third of all the private timber cutting in western Washington was in young growth. Research is needed to develop an intensive culture for these young-growth forests. This research has been started at Olympia, Wash., but is hampered by the lack of adequate facilities.

One of the problems in the western timber industry is the terrific loss suffered from animal damage to young forests. This loss is now estimated to be about $15 million a year in the Pacific Northwest alone. It is most serious on areas where a high investment has been made in seeding and planting a new forest, only to have it destroyed by rodents, deer, elk, and other animals. Even older trees are damaged by bears and porcupines. Chemical repellents and other controls now in use are only partially effective. Animal damage research at Olympia will seek to develop more effective controls, but this will require improved facilities for the laboratory phases of the research.

This new facility would materially assist research on two of the many critical problems facing the western timber industry at this time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, under date of June 7, and a letter from the Department of Natural Resources the State of Washington, dated May 25, in reply to my letter of June 4.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., June 7, 1962.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I am glad to supply the information you requested in your letter of June 4 about our program and plans for forestry research at Olympia, Wash.

We have two projects underway there now: (1) Studies of how to improve the production of second-growth Douglas-fir and related species through better cultural practices; and (2) investigations of ways to prevent and control animal damage to forests. Both projects are directed toward the most critical problems of present management in the western Cascades region now and in the years ahead. As you are aware, there is an increasing area of young growth forest being created as the older stands are harvested. Maintaining future timber production will depend on having a strong scientific basis for solving the many technical cultural problems that arise. Animal damage is unfortunately a serious problem in these same areas. Ways must be found to prevent the losses caused by animals to many forms of tree growth.

Future plans call for strengthening the present work on the two projects as fast as overall budgetary situations permit. Such increases are included in the national forestry research program estimates which are a part of the fiscal year 1963 Senate Appropriations hearings record and will be as follows:

Project	Expenditures for research	
	Fiscal year 1962	Future need
Improving cultural practices	$37,000	$180,000
Prevention and control of animal damage	32,000	120,000
Total	69,000	300,000

In fiscal year 1963 we hope to increase the animal damage project by about $15,000. Even so, there is still quite a way to go to get the two projects implemented to the proposed level.

Our laboratory facilities at Olympia, now very limited, would have to be developed. We estimate this will require a total of $350,000—a laboratory building at $300,000, and special scientific equipment and auxiliary facilities, $50,000. A site for this building has already been made available by the State of Washington.

I hope that this information adequately answers your questions.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD P. CLIFF,
Chief.
By V. L. HARPER.

JUNE 4, 1962.

MR. EDWARD P. CLIFF,
Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLIFF: I have just returned from a trip to the State of Washington and while there I encountered a great deal of interest in the future plans of the Forest Service in regard to the research center at Olympia, Wash. Will you give me the answers to the following questions?

What plans do you have for expansion of the research center at Olympia?

What type of research will be done at this center?

What funds for capital outlay would be necessary to accomplish an effective research program at the Olympic center?

Any other information which you have in regard to the center will be most appreciated.

Thank you and kind regards.

Sincerely,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES,
Olympia, Wash., May 25, 1962.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MAGGIE: I certainly appreciated the efforts put forth by you and your staff in making me feel at home on my recent visit to Washington, D.C.

MAGGIE, I wish you would consider the possibility of asking the Forest Service if they have plans for the expansion of the research center at Olympia; what type of research would be done at this center; and what funds they feel would be necessary for capital outlay to accomplish an effective research program for the forest problems that they plan to study. It seems strange that Oregon and some of the other States are able to receive approval for their Forest Service capital outlay funds, and the request for our State is ignored. I know that the people in research in the Fish and Wildlife Service and our State Department of Natural Resources, as well as those in research working out of region 6, feel there is an urgent need for an expansion of the

Olympia Research Center. I do hope there is still an opportunity to have the funds approved for this expansion program at this session of Congress.

Relative to the lumber import problem, I am enclosing some data from a financial newsletter that I receive which should be helpful to your staff in giving them a broader appreciation of the problem.

I do hope you are successful in increasing the Forest Service appropriation for the road development program.

I certainly enjoyed the opportunity to visit with you at lunch the other day and am looking forward to being of some effective use during your coming campaign.

Sincerely,

BERT L. COLE,
Commissioner of Public Lands.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, the pending order of business is an amendment to increase access roads in the Forest Service from $2 million to $6 million. Last night, before the Senate adjourned, I placed in the RECORD a statement which I offered on behalf of myself, my colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senators from Oregon [Mr. MORSE and Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senators from California [Mr. ENGLE and Mr. KUCHEL], which very well states the whole situation, and which, I believe, is ample proof of why this amount should be increased from $2 million to $6 million.

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, this problem is of great interest and concern to me, because as a member of the Commerce Committee I participated in the hearings in Washington and in Olympia, Wash., and more recently in Lewiston, Idaho. I was not able to be present at a meeting held not long since at Portland, Oreg. The problem of Canadian competition with American lumber is of great gravity. It concerns Alaska to a very slight extent, as compared with the Pacific Northwest States, but apparently the competition even there is becoming greater all the time.

First I wish to say that the attention which has been paid to this problem by the senior Senator from Washington, the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] is praiseworthy in every way. He has devoted his time and efforts to it, and has held many hearings in many sections of the country, because this very urgent problem does exist.

As we have gone from point to point in the holding of these hearings, many different reasons have been advanced by the lumber people as to why they are losing steadily much of the American market, and why Canadian lumber is moving in to take the place of American lumber.

Some people have told us that the railroad freehold provision is an instrumental factor. Others have said—and this is particularly so on the west coast—that the transportation differential in favor of the Canadians poses a serious threat and, in fact, is an overwhelming handicap so far as American producers are concerned. Of course, everyone now speaks about the depreciation of the Canadian dollar. Forest Service policies have come in for much criticism by those who are engaged in the lumber industry.

Whatever the cause or causes, the fact is that mills are closing constantly in the great Pacific Northwest States, and too often the communities where they are located are one-industry towns. When a mill closes there is no employment in that area.

Something, indeed, must be done about the problem. Curative measures must be found, and found quickly.

Personally, I wish to say that the Senators and Representatives from these States, including the junior Senator from Washington, who is in the Chamber, and the Presiding Officer, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], have done much in trying to reach solutions. Of course, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] participated in the hearing at Portland which was held only the other day. That hearing was conducted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. And the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Congresswoman from that district [Mrs. PFOST] were with me at Lewiston.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated with my remarks a letter from Charles M. Hines, president of the Edward Hines Lumber Co., of Chicago; also an editorial which appeared the other day in the Portland Oregonian of June 7, entitled "Buyers Versus Forests," in which considerable reference is made to statements made by Joseph W. McCracken, executive vice president of the Western Forest Industries Association, a most knowledgeable person in the field of the lumber industry.

Of course, I am for the amendment proposed by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to increase access road funds. More such roads need to be built. I intend to vote for more money so more timber will be accessible. If the amendment is adopted and the extra money remains in the bill, a forward step will have been taken, one of many which will be necessary before American industry again becomes truly competitive.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDWARD HINES LUMBER CO.,
Chicago, Ill., May 10, 1962.

Hon. E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I was present, with Mr. Joseph J. Fitzgerald of our company, at the recent hearings on timber problems before the Magnuson committee, and know of your great interest in finding a solution to those problems that confront so many converters of public timber, and the communities that are dependent upon them.

During the past 2 weeks we have received and reviewed copies of Chief Forester Cliff's memorandum to Secretary Freeman and the Secretary's letter to the northwest Senators. While I thought that the March 5 letter that the Senators sent Secretary Freeman was excellent, reflecting a realistic understanding of the basic problems we face, I am greatly disappointed with the Secretary's reply and the Cliff memorandum it encloses.

The Forest Service bluntly reiterates all of its policies of the past, with the possible exception of conceding that some of its forests are not operating on a realistic allowable cut.

Mr. Cliff urges restoration of the $800,000 cut in timber sale appropriations made by the House. If the Forest Service adopts the Graves report, and likewise agrees to a maximum timber sale program consistent with sustained yield, it is quite proper that they be granted sufficient money for timber sales procedures. However, Mr. Cliff infers in his letter that Forest Service public relations need improving and recommends that a large sum of money be appropriated for that entirely different purpose. It is quite true that their public relations are deplorable, due solely to the fact that sawmill operators, plywood mills, loggers, cattle ranchers, and sheep grazers, are deeply disturbed because representatives of the Forest Service have been arbitrary, brusk, and impractical in dealing with them. We recommend that the Senate committee restore this $800,000 providing it is clearly agreed that all the money appropriated for timber management be devoted to that purpose.

I remember when the Forest Service in the days of Mr. Watts, Mr. Granger, Mr. Carter, and others enjoyed the best possible relationship with Congressmen and Senators in the timber States. They received the greatest cooperation from our legislators. I am afraid there is a tendency now for the Forest Service to consider itself an autonomous bureau, entrusted with our national timber resources which shall be used and managed in the manner it determines.

It is also quite apparent that the Chief Forester, after reviewing the serious charges made by the industry and Senators and Congressmen, at the February 21 meeting with Secretary Freeman, has now found these charges to be unsubstantial and has rejected them in their entirety.

While the Service promises further study in respect to certain recommendations of the industry, I fear that it is only paying lipservice to the suggestions that have been made and that no results can be expected, excepting as you and other Senators urge them into action.

Interwoven in Mr. Cliff's statement are many indications of deep resentment against the lumber industry and all those that have dared to take their cause before the public and to their elected representatives. Our company has tried to inform our employees and townspeople of the dangers to their welfare inherent in the present practices of the Forest Service. This is resented by the Portland office, even though it is quite clear that our employees, the communities dependent on our operations, and our material suppliers have the same vital interest in this matter as do the operators.

After a long experience of some 30 years with various administrators of the Forest Service at all levels, I am simply astounded that that agency has retrogressed so far and has now assumed such a resentment against petitions of our industry that were supported so unanimously by you.

In fact, the Cliff memorandum now takes the incredible attitude that any publicly expressed difference with the Forest Service is controversial, and that the Service alone settles all controversies. It even states that—

"Part of the cause for recurrence of the same issues is refusal of industry representatives to accept decisions which the Forest Service considers to be the resolution of an issue."

While I deplore such arbitrary action, as I am sure that you do, I am gratified that the Service has exposed its true feelings. The issues are now sharply drawn. They have now put our industry, the communities dependent on our operations, our timbered States, and congressional representatives on notice that the relationship of the Forest Service with its monopoly control over tim-

ber raw materials in the lumber-oriented States must be clarified once and for all if the lumber industry and all that are dependent on it are to survive.

For many years, our company as one of the largest buyers of national forest timber, had excellent relations with the Forest Service. While we did not always agree and we did find it necessary to frequently bring our practical problems of logging and manufacturing to the attention of their top officials, we did get fair treatment, and everyone, including the timbering communities, benefited to the great satisfaction of the Forest Service and ourselves. With the help of our congressional representatives, this relationship can be restored, provided the Forest Service does not consider itself an independent bureau, responsible to no one.

As you may know, I consider it important that Federal timber be made available on a free competitive basis to all who convert timber, both large and small. We larger operators, that are wholly dependent upon Government timber, have the same problems and responsibilities in operating Federal timber as do the other converters. In our case, some large sales must be made available for our large production so that we can employ a large number of people. When we have problems with the Forest Service, we have able logging engineers and general managers to represent aggressively our interests before the Forest Service. Even with this help we have been unable to secure the quality of timber as advertised by the Forest Service or build our roads within the limits provided in their appraisals. On the other hand, the smaller operator is penalized even more as his resources do not permit such losses. An appeals procedure must be provided in each region for all operators. It must particularly meet the needs of the small people who cannot employ lawyers and engineers to represent them. A road cost that exceeds estimates by $5,000 might very well ruin a small operator. Many of them have been driven to seek Government loans for this reason.

I am enclosing in this letter a draft of our proposal for an improved, impartial appeals procedure. If practical, experienced men are appointed to these local appeal boards that are familiar with timber, logging and manufacturing, at least in a general way, every small operator as well as ourselves will have available in each region an impartial board that can at least act as a brake on any arbitrary and unyielding, unilateral actions upon the part of the Forest Service in the future. These procedures must be informal, and the board must be prepared often to go into the field to review important questions of roads and timber quality, with representatives of the operator and Forest Service present to give their respective sides of the story. It is to be hoped that the establishment of such a procedure would relieve all of you in Congress from this multitude of complaints and disputes as there is no other impartial body to whom the operators can take their grievances.

I do not know of anything that you can accomplish that will have a greater significance to timbered States, and the welfare of their fine people and communities than to restore proper Forest Service concern for stability of timber supply and maintenance of employment in the communities dependent on the national forests. The Service and Agriculture must have the restraining hand of those in your position who know and understand that solutions to the timber problem are absolutely necessary to stabilize communities, make for better jobs, and a healthy forest industry.

Sincerely,

CHARLES M. HINES,
President.

BUYERS VERSUS FORESTS

Both the U.S. Forest Service and provincial timber authorities in British Columbia base stumpage prices on the price of the finished product—lumber or plywood. From the product selling price are deducted costs for falling, bucking, yarding, transportation to the mill, manufacturing, administration and selling. Allowances are made also for building access roads and for profit and risk.

But the British Columbia lumber manufacturer pays much more lower stumpage prices for Government timber, in most instances giving him a substantial advantage over his Pacific Northwest competitor. This advantage, along with others in shipping costs, currency manipulation, etc., has made it possible for British Columbia lumbermen to cut deeply and dangerously into the U.S. domestic market.

At the hearing conducted in Portland Monday by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, timber and lumber operators got down to specifics in their campaign to soften the policies and attitudes of the Forest Service. Comparing the methods by which Forest Service and British Columbia authorities arrive at stumpage prices, Joseph W. McCracken, executive vice president of the Western Forest Industries Assn., made the following points:

Canadian grading systems and practices are different.

The U.S. buyer of Government timber must build roads along the routes and to the specifications imposed by the Forest Service; in British Columbia, the operator may build his roads on routes and to whatever specifications are satisfactory to him.

Unlike the Forest Service, British Columbia bases its timber appraisals on current, not predicted, lumber prices.

The allowance in British Columbia for profit and risk runs up to 50 percent higher than the allowance made by the Forest Service.

Many witnesses at the hearing leveled charges at the Forest Service, involving alleged bureaucratic disregard for the welfare of timber purchasers and the communities dependent on Federal timber for their livelihoods, and even of the Forest Service's own policies. Mr. McCracken declared that if the Forest Service applied its own announced policy on rotation ages, the annual allowable cut in western Oregon would be increased by 294.5 million feet and in Washington by 205.5 million feet.

He asserted that a new, scientifically produced inventory for the Siuslaw National Forest was ignored. The allowable cut used is 23 percent below the one the new inventory would have justified. If the rotation age approved by the Forest Service were applied to the new inventory figures, the annual allowable cut in the Siuslaw Forest would jump from 327 million feet to more than 500 million.

The witnesses stressed the elaborate roads they are required to build, scaling practices which sometimes compel them to pay for timber that independent scalers cannot find, failure to sell the full allowable cut on a predictable basis, or to increase allowable cuts when new inventories show they should be. Figures were produced to show that hundreds of mills have been forced to close and that more will have to shut down.

It was a one-sided hearing. The Forest Service will have its innings later in Washington, D.C. But the figures were so alarming and the complaints so unanimous that a listener was convinced there is considerable fire as well as smoke in the woods. The old fight between timber buyers and the Forest Service has broadened to include the whole economy of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. McCracken pointed out that, unlike the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Forest Service has no basic policymaking organization above it. In the Department of Agriculture, of which it is a part, there is no higher group expert in forest resource management. As a consequence, technicians make as well as administer the policy, and from their decisions there is no appeal to an independent agency.

It would be better for the Forest Service and its many fine people, as well as for the timber industry, if basic policy were set on a higher level. Maybe the Senate hearings held in several parts of the Northwest will lead to some such solution.

Mr. JACKSON. Madam President, my senior colleague has discussed in detail the major problems which now beset the timber industry in this country. I should like to associate myself with his remarks and those of the senior Senator from Alaska, and emphasize certain matters which I think are of special concern.

For many months it has been apparent that the American timber industry has been suffering economic difficulties because of the effects of Canadian competition. The ability of our timber industry to meet this competition and to survive as a healthy segment of the economy is tied directly to the policies and activities of the National Forest Service.

Of major importance is the need for adequate financing of the Forest Service access road program. Senator MAGNUSON has offered and amendment to provide funds which are needed immediately to obtain access on existing private roads in the national forests. As he has pointed out, the proposed increase of funds from $2 to $6 million is nothing more than a sound investment. It is not a subsidy. The availability of access roads will be reflected in the price for stumpage, and any increase in the funds for the access road program will be returned to the Federal Treasury. It is extremely important that this increase be voted in order to permit a substantial increase in the marketing of national forest timber.

Secondly, as Senator MAGNUSON pointed out, the Forest Service must improve its performance in the handling of timber sales. The timber industry has a right to depend on greater reliability and stability in marketing national forest timber. The timber industry is almost totally dependent on sales of national forest timber. Too often the scheduling and extent of these sales has been so erratic that the price of stumpage has been artificially increased, with severe consequences to the industry and to the many communities that are dependent upon it. I am satisfied that with adequate road financing the allowable cut can be increased. In any case, there is no reason to doubt that greater regularity and efficiency in timber sales can be realized. The responsibility for providing necessary access road funds lies with the Congress. The responsibility for efficient management of timber sales lies with the National Forest Service. It is vitally necessary to the health of our timber industry that both of these responsibilities be met.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, I merely wish to add one statement for the RECORD, which I believe is now quite complete. What is sought is not an expenditure of money. This money will come back to the Treasury. Whenever a stand of timber is sold, if access roads are involved, the cost is added to the sale. It is estimated by the Forest Service that the amount we are suggesting would come back to the Treasury in the next 16 months. I know that the Senator from Wyoming is interested in this matter.

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, what I should like to know is whether this money would be available for use for multiple access, that is for access for other purposes, other than merely for timber.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This matter was discussed in some detail with the Forest Service. Naturally, an access road into a timber area should be available and would be available to people for recreational purposes. I must say for the private timber people that they have been very cooperative. Whenever they have built an access road or whenever they have bid on a stand of timber and then built the road, they have always added the cost of the road to the price.

The average citizen may enter the forest to hunt, fish, or view the scenery. Such areas are used for recreational purposes. The Forest Service is most insistent that when an access road is agreed to, or whenever there is an exchange of roads between Forest Service timber and private timber, the recreational facilities of the area shall not be diminished.

I think this proposal would add to the recreational facilities of the United States. Not only is this a western problem; it is a problem which confronts the entire country.

Mr. McGEE. Madam President, we who come from the Western States appreciate the initiative of the Senator from Washington. I am delighted to have his special explanation that the access roads will be made available for other uses, as well. That will be of particular interest to the people in my area.

Our timber producers will follow this proposal with keen interest, but there are many other users and uses, so the people of my area will be comforted to know that they will receive consideration. I commend the Senator from Washington for his leadership.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Sometimes various factions argue about the cost of access roads and how much is to be written off for recreational purposes. But that is an administrative problem. I suggest that there has not been too much trouble. In general, those who are in disagreement finally agree on a satisfactory solution.

Mr. McGEE. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Washington to say that he expects these roads to be built ultimately at no cost to the taxpayer?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. This would be one of the finest investments that could be made. Not only would the money come back directly from the roads, but the roads would open up some available allowable cut which otherwise, for lack of access, might rot.

Mr. McGEE. It would result in new economic development which, in turn, would produce additional taxes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is another factor which enters into the situation.

About a year ago, the Attorney General ruled, concerning the right of access to timber, that a person who owned timber was not a settler in the literal sense; therefore, he did not have an absolute right to ingress and egress for his timber.

That posed a problem for the Forest Service concerning the making of exchanges with private persons for access roads. The Forest Service is now drafting rules and regulations which will be satisfactory to all concerned. Several meetings have been held on this subject. The whole area will open up to provide not only recovery, but allowable cuts, which will do much for the benefit of our forests.

I believe that to skimp on this item would be penny wise and pound foolish. The Government would not only get back all the money it might spend on the project, but would also open up allowable cuts of timber for the Forest Service. Conservative as the Forest Service is, it would benefit from the additional cuts which might be made. Also, the Forest Service would be able to make exchanges of timber and be of assistance in opening up additional recreation areas throughout the country.

Mr. McGEE. Not only is this not a spending program, it is an investment program. It will be good business and will provide a measurable economic return which will enrich both the Treasury and the area served.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think almost everyone will agree to that.

Another thing which will happen, which we who come from the West can understand, will be that the smaller operator will have an opportunity to compete by cutting certain timber which a large timber operator might, perhaps, allow to stand.

Mr. McGEE. A larger timber operator might be able to afford to let the timber stand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. But the timber operators are not opposed to this proposal. They want to open up and use the forests, because this country is rapidly reaching the point where we have a sustained yield. It is long overdue, but that point is being reached. So when we speak about allowable cuts, we are not proposing to waste the resources of the timberlands of the United States. The access roads which will be built will open up those lands and make it easier for everybody to do the job which was long ago begun in the conservation of our natural resources.

The Senator from California understands the situation very well. There is no place in the United States where access roads are more urgently needed and where recreational facilities are so readily available than in northern California.

Mr. McGEE. The Senator from Washington will have my complete support. My State of Wyoming will welcome this appeal, because our timber producers, who are very active, are generally small operators; and second, because of our appeal to tourists. This project would provide a welcome outlet for the development and expansion of touring opportunities in Wyoming.

With all due respect to California, which has a large recreational demand, Wyoming has one attraction that this proposal would make available as a magnet to draw tourists; namely, the absence of large numbers of people. Ours in an appeal to visit the wide open spaces, to "get away from it all." This is a strong appeal and will afford increased opportunities for that type of recreation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some of the large timber producers have been more than cooperative concerning the recreational feature; in fact, they have encouraged it. I think that is laudable.

Furthermore, this proposal will represent a wise investment for another reason. I do not know what the actual loss from forest fires is in any given year. That information can be supplied later for the RECORD. But I know that whenever access roads are built into an area of timber, the possibility of loss by fire is minimized. The access roads would serve as a premium for the whole United States, and would serve as the best investment in the nature of insurance against forest fires.

Mr. McGEE. It would really be an extra dividend, because it has not been calculated as a part of the return.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; that factor has not been included in the cost.

Mr. KUCHEL. Madam President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. First, I congratulate the distinguished senior Senator from Washington. He has performed a service in offering his amendment today. He has performed a service not alone to the conservation of American natural resources in the great West, from which he and I and you, Madam President, come; but also he has performed a specific service to the lumber industry of the United States.

The lumber industry in America is sick. A few weeks ago I participated in a hearing conducted by the Senator from Washington, in which a number of Senators from both sides of the aisle were present and participated. There it was indicated to what extent the American lumber industry is declining, and how unemployment in that industry is mounting. We learned that lumber imported into the United States from abroad is being sold both on the eastern seaboard and even in the West at prices well below our own. American lumber producers are finding it increasingly difficult to compete in their own country with this influx of foreign lumber.

In the Senate yesterday the able Senator from Washington provided us with an accurate description of this problem. He said, in part:

> In fiscal year 1961 there was a terrible fall down in national forest timber sale performance. Only 77 percent of the timber offered for sale was sold. In * * * California only

62 percent of financed timber was sold. In the Idaho-Montana region it was 79 percent. In the Oregon-Washington region 82 percent was sold. In the Rocky Mountain region—Colorado, South Dakota, and Wyoming—only 44 percent of the timber financed for sale was sold; and in Alaska, a mere 31 percent was sold. The Lake States region—Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois—shows a record of only 64 percent sold. The record in previous years has sometimes been better and sometimes worse. It is a very spotty record.

Mr. President, I agree with the observations of the Senator from Washington. The Forest Service must improve its timber sale performance in California and they must modify those allowable cuts to meet modern sustained yield requirements.

I am delighted that my good friend from Washington recognizes that we do not need to invade the wilderness for timber. I would make the point that careful management on the commercial forest land in the national forests increases the timber supply and thus protects our wilderness areas.

At the hearing which the Senator from Washington held sufficient evidence was adduced to demonstrate that we are dealing with a multiplicity of legislative programs in attempting to alleviate the plight which confronts some of our domestic industries. Trade legislation will soon be before the Senate. The passage of a comprehensive and realistic reciprocal trade bill is of crucial importance to the economic future of the United States and the people of my own State. In 1960, California was America's leading exporter with over $1.8 billion. Problems with respect to the balance of payments continue to plague us. But here is one opportunity for the Senate, by adopting the amendment which the Senator from Washington has offered, to do a constructive chore for conservation and for the timber industry of the United States. If this amendment is adopted, the Forest Service can accelerate its authority to acquire needed access roads, so as to open up new areas in the forest regions. Under the theory of allowable cuts, new timber could begin to move in a properly competitive situation. Our producers will have some relief from heavy, almost unbearable, stumpage competition at the raw material stage and Canadian competition at the lumber selling end.

In my judgment, the Bureau of the Budget has made a request for inadequate funds in this area; let the RECORD clearly indicate that. I regret that the House of Representatives did nothing in regard to this problem. I stand for economy but here we would not be economizing, we would be aiding unemployment by holding timber unavailable. But to the credit of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], this amendment would provide the Forest Service, in the Department of Agriculture, with sufficient funds to do the job, realistically and vigorously. Congress, and particularly the Senate has before it a specific opportunity to reduce the sickness of the lumber industry in America and to do something constructive for it.

I salute the Senator from Washington; and I hope the amendment will be overwhelmingly adopted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from California. He is one of America's great conservation leaders, broad in perspective, always constructive, and constantly effective.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection——

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not now in order.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Then, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard; and the clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to add a little to the RECORD in regard to the matter of access roads.

The Senator from California and I have long been concerned with this problem; and I think the best compliment I could pay him is that when one Senator asked me, "Are you ready for the roll call on this amendment?" I replied to that Senator, "Wait until the Senator from California speaks on this matter, because he will be of immeasurable help to us in connection with this problem."

The Senator from California has been dedicated to this matter, because he and I have long since discovered that our forests form a great field for conservation. We have practically come to a permanent sustained yield, but we are actually losing our forests because of inaccessibility to the places where the cuts can be allowed.

The Senator from California talks about an allowable cut. I do not think anyone would ever accuse the Forest Service of being loose in its estimates on what should or should not be cut. The Forest Service leans the other way.

When we talk about a 44-percent, a 50-percent, or a 60-percent allowable cut, we are talking about, and the Senator from California is talking about, a great deal of forest timber that is lying there, decaying.

Mr. KUCHEL. Wasting.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, wasting, because it cannot be gotten to. When we ask for this money, we are not only suggesting that we be able to get to the allowable cut, but also that when people get there, they pay back what it cost to build the road; and we have recreation facilities, in addition.

I compliment the Senator from California for his help.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I asked for recognition in order to speak briefly on a matter of great urgency to our State, and I think to other States along the Atlantic and other coastlines of the country. As a result of the storm in the spring, as I think everyone knows, a great deal of the beach protection in the form of dunes was destroyed; and the Army Engineers have developed a plan for erecting temporary, low dune barriers in order to prevent the next storm from completing the devastation, which would be awful in its consequences.

This program has been underway in New Jersey and other areas along the Atlantic coast, but we have run into the situation in New Jersey—and I am sure the situation may exist elsewhere also—that a considerable amount of the shore front is not accessible to the Engineers for the building of these temporary dune protections.

Our State conservation commissioner, H. Mat Adams, reported recently that the State needs to acquire 17 miles of beach front in order to make it possible for the Army Engineers to complete the necessary temporary emergency barriers. Commissioner Adams urges that the Federal Government should have a part in this proposal, and, to that end, that the bill which the Senate passed last year, S. 543, which is now pending in the House, be passed by the House and implemented as quickly as possible.

There appeared in the Newark Star Ledger for June 3, 1962, an article on this subject, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE SEEKS MORE LAND TO AVERT NEW SHORE CRISIS

The Jersey coast faces a crisis this hurricane season unless Congress immediately passes legislation that would enable the State to buy $6 million in private land for beach protection, State Conservation Commissioner H. Mat Adams reported yesterday.

Adams said about 17 miles of real estate along the coast must still be bought to carry out the new beach and sand dune protection program and there is no money for it.

The old protection was washed away in the March 6 storm and will have to be rebuilt further back on private land.

The State and towns, however, do not have the necessary funds to buy the land at present and not a penny of the emergency Federal aid available may be spent for land purchases, under present law.

WANT PERMISSION

The U.S. Corps of Army Engineers will not build the protection on private land without permission of the municipal governments.

"They could pull out and leave the protection down unless they get approval," said Adams, who made the $6 million land acquisition estimate.

The State legislature has a statute allowing $400,000 in matching funds for purchase of real estate. But the Federal legislation has not come through.

The commissioner said the solution to the financial woe would be passage of a Senate-approved bill by the House.

The Federal bill would grant funds up to $25 million to the 12 States along the Atlantic coastline for land purchase for recreational facilities.

"If this bill is passed speedily, the Federal Government could alleviate the land crisis and we could build protection by summer's end," explained Adams.

Adams cited Sea Isle City as an example of a community in need of help from the Federal Government.

"That town lost 35 percent of its ratables and there are not any beaches left," he said. "It's in tough financial shape." But if the Government bill passes, the town would qualify for more aid and it could buy the land for beach fortification.

Another measure of help could be supplied by President Kennedy's public works bill that was approved by the Senate last week.

This measure provides for projects—including seawalls and bulkheads to be completed in a year with 100 percent Federal funds.

In addition to the financial troubles, the commissioner said, there also is a sand shortage.

"It will take us at least 2 years to get the sand back on the beaches as it was before the March storm," he explained.

Adams estimated that at least 50 million cubic yards of sand was washed away or ended up in the ocean and bay, elsewhere on the shore, though the overall picture is not so bleak.

EMERGENCY HELP

Emergency protection for the coastline is being built on an around-the-clock, 7-day-a-week basis in order to meet the August 15 deadline, the start of the hurricane season.

The State has about $9 million in matching funds for repair work to shore communities. It has requests for $21 million.

Some towns, however, are financing their own rebuilding through bond issues.

Adams compiled a town-by-town list of repairs made thus far:

At Sea Bright and the north end of Monmouth Beach there are two dredges pumping sand for beach protection. They are a quarter way done, and should be finished before the deadline.

BEACH BUILDUP

Beaches are being built up in Deal, Block Harbor, Belmar, Bradley Beach, Spring Lake, and Ocean Grove. Some jetty repairs will be made in these communities.

The three beaches in Long Beach Island at Holgate have been filled but on the beach front work still goes on.

Shores dunes here are halfway completed. The dunes will be higher than the last.

Harvey Cedars is 95 percent finished on its 2-mile protection program.

In Atlantic County, Brigantine has a dune alinement program and dredges are working to fill in the beaches.

Ocean City is proceeding with plans to build two bulkheads—one 1,600 and the other 13,000 feet—to repair its beach front.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Insofar as it bears upon this problem, that bill would authorize Federal participation with the States, to the extent of 50 percent, for the acquisition of shoreline recreational areas. A total of $25 million would be authorized to be appropriated for this purpose by the bill as passed by the Senate.

I believe the Secretary has some assurance that the House plans to act with reasonable promptness. I believe there should be some assurance from the Department of the Interior that when the bill is passed the Department will act promptly with regard to the New Jersey problem. I should like to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee a question in this regard.

Assuming action is taken by the House, and that the area along the New Jersey shore and other areas along other shores are recommended by the Secretary of the Interior for participation in the Federal aid program—which would include, of course, a request for supplemental appropriations for that purpose—can the chairman of our committee give assurance that immediate action would be taken by our committee to consider and to act upon the request for any such supplemental appropriations? I feel sure the chairman will so assure us. The point, of course, is that unless the emergency works are completed by the 15th of August, which is the beginning of the hurricane season, there is grave danger there will be serious damage, such as the shoreline suffered last spring, perhaps in even greater and more severe and disastrous form.

If I may, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, with whom, of course, I have already discussed the problem, if he can give us any assurance in that regard.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has made it perfectly evident that there is an emergency situation, which brooks no delay. So far as I am concerned—and I am sure I speak for the committee—I believe the committee will be glad to do anything it can to expedite the program as soon as the House passes the bill.

Of course, the program must be authorized by law. If an authorization bill is passed and there is an appropriation bill from the House, there would be no delay on this side.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I appreciate the chairman's statement very much. I thank the acting majority leader for his courtesy in giving me this time.

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, while the distinguished chairman of the committee is in the Chamber, I should like to invite to his attention the fact that there is a substantial item in the bill under what we call the National Park Service. As the chairman knows, the Department of the Interior is considering the creation of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, to take care of recreational and outdoor facilities classified under the appropriate heading.

There is nothing in the bill to prevent the Secretary from doing that, and from allocating whatever funds are necessary for the administration of those activities, is there?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no prohibition, no.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I recall, the other body in its report made some recommendations on that matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. The reorganization plan of 1950 authorized that proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, in connection with the pending measure I wish to mention the newly created Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

At the time the House acted on H.R. 10802, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation had not been created. The House noted in its report that the President in his February 28, 1962, message on conservation had expressed his intention of creating such a Bureau in the Department of the Interior. The House report concludes as follows:

> At that time the committee will expect that the amounts provided in the bill for nationwide recreation planning, $504,337, and for cooperation with States and other agencies, $596,759, will be transferred to the new Bureau.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation was created by the Secretary of the Interior on April 2, 1962, which was subsequent to the House action. In addition, by Executive Order 11017 dated April 27, 1962, the President established a Recreation Advisory Council and provided generally for coordination with respect to outdoor recreation resources.

I believe this Bureau of Outdoor Recreation will perform a most vital function in an area of ever growing importance. Should the Department of Interior need additional funds to carry out this program, I am confident that the Congress will be receptive to its request. It is quite clear now that the Secretary can utilize funds provided under the terms of the pending bill for this particular Bureau. I am confident that the funds invested will reap a rich dividend in extending to the American people wider opportunity to enjoy the great outdoors.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY AT YALE UNIVERSITY COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered yesterday by President Kennedy at Yale University commencement exercises be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS AT YALE UNIVERSITY

President [A. Whitney] Griswold, members of the faculty and fellows, graduates and their families, ladies and gentlemen, let me begin by expressing my appreciation for the very deep honor that you have conferred upon me.

As General de Gaulle occasionally acknowledges America to be the daughter of Europe, so I am pleased to come to Yale, the daughter of Harvard.

It might be said now that I have the best of both worlds. A Harvard education and a Yale degree.

I am particularly glad to become a Yale man because, as I think about my troubles, I find that a lot of them have come from other Yale men. Among businessmen I have had a minor disagreement with Roger Blough of the law school class of 1931, and I have had some complaints too from my friend

supplier of economic aid. And Japan, only 17 years ago, we remember, was a nation devastated both militarily and economically."

Our reciprocal trade relations with Japan constitute one of the compelling reasons for constantly closer ties between Denki Roren and the IUE. I say this because in the electrical and electronic manufacturing industry—far more than in any other industry—Japanese and American unionists share the same employers, or share employing companies that are financially interlocked.

The IUE's biggest employer, for example, is General Electric which is the largest single stockholder in Toshiba, one of Japan's top electrical manufacturers. GE, I am advised, owns 12 percent of Toshiba, and Toshiba currently turns out transistors and radios under GE brand names.

Westinghouse, our second largest manufacturer, has complex financial arrangements with Mitsubishi Electric Co., of Tokyo; and another of our employers, General Precision Instrument, also has an agreement with Mitsubishi whereby General Precision will own 40 percent of a new Mitsubishi company to produce General Precision products in Japan.

Another of the giants of American industry, Radio Corp. of America, markets sets both in the United States and elsewhere manufactured by your Sanyo Electric Co., of Osaka.

And so it goes; the list is long and the corporate and financial interrelations are often extremely complex.

But one thing is obvious. These interlocking relations between American and Japanese producers is an overwhelmingly powerful argument for collaboration between Denki Roren and the IUE to seek "international fair labor standards."

Exchange of information, exchange of delegations, cooperation in periods of negotiations and even in times of strike—these can be immensely valuable to both Denki Roren and the IUE.

Democratic unionism, joined together across the continents and across the seas, is one of the last great hopes of peace and freedom in the world.

It is my hope and our international union's hope that our relations with Denki Roren will be brought much closer and much more effective—as President Kennedy has suggested in his message to you—by a visit to the United States and to our union's 10th constitutional convention of your esteemed President Takehana. We will look forward to being his host and host to those of his colleagues who can accompany him to the United States. We will, I am sure, profit greatly by his address to our convention and by our discussions of mutual problems and goals.

A very few days ago, in Washington, Japanese Ambassador Asakai declared:

"In the 102 years since the arrival of the first Japanese Ambassador to Washington, relations between Japan and the United States have never been better than they are today."

I believe we can say exactly the same about relations between the labor movements of Japan and the United States—and we pledge ourselves in the months and years to come to make our fraternity—of Denki Roren and the IUE, of the Japanese labor movement and the American labor movement—always more mutually beneficial and fruitful.

PROMINENT REPUBLICAN FAVORS MEDICAL CARE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have some good news for the Senate today. I notice that a prominent Republican favors medical care under social security.

Last week the first convention of the National Council of Senior Citizens for Health Care through Social Security met here in Washington and was addressed by Dr. Arthur Larson, a onetime Special Assistant to President Eisenhower. Dr. Larson, a prominent Republican, having served as Under Secretary of Labor and as Director of the U.S. Information Agency, endorsed social security health benefits as the right way to provide medical care for the aged.

I think Dr. Larson's support for this program is especially significant in light of his acknowledged standing as an authority on social security law, and workman's compensation law. His best-known work in this field is a layman's guide to social security, entitled "Know Your Social Security." It is heartening to know that a scholar of Dr. Larson's stature is a proponent of this administration's program for health care under social security.

In closing, I would like to quote from his address to the Senior Citizens Council and to commend him for his stand on one of the most far-reaching welfare proposals in our history. Dr. Larson said:

> Social security health benefits are not an entering wedge for socialized medicine, and they definitely are the American way of handling the financial problems of hospital and medical care for the aged.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I join the Senator from Minnesota in expressing appreciation and satisfaction at Dr. Larson's speech to that group, and also his confirmation of a position which I myself have long held in regard to the question of medical care for the aged, and provision for it under the Social Security system, which I think is entirely sound.

I also express the hope that following the suggestions made by the administration spokesmen—I believe the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently was one of those, and there have been others recently—a serious effort will be made within the basic principles of the Social Security system to enact appropriate legislation at this session of Congress.

To that end I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared yesterday in the New York Times.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I saw that editorial. I hoped that it might be included in the RECORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which reference has been made be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECISION DAYS ON MEDICAL CARE

The next 2 weeks will determine whether anything is to come this year of all the sound and fury over medical care for the aged. The House Ways and Means Committee will meet in closed session to discuss the administration's plan for a program based on social security, as well as the welter of substitute proposals put forward by Republicans and conservative Democrats. Intense horse trading is probable, but most observers already predict that it will wind up without any bill.

This may be a welcome outcome to politicians on both sides, who usually like a lively campaign issue better than a law. But it will do nothing to relieve the health needs of elderly persons or the financial aches their ailments often create for their families. We hope the administration and the critics of its plan will use this period for a genuine attempt to agree on a program all can back in good conscience.

There are many areas of potential compromise that would not impair reliance on the sound insurance principles of social security. Chief among these would be a formula for protecting those uncovered by the social security system—a total of 3 million persons, or one-sixth of the country's aged population. Nearly half of these would be eligible for benefits on the basis of financial need under the Kerr-Mills Act and other existing public assistance programs. The President indicated in his news conference last week his readiness to support measures to provide comparable help to others outside social security. Such universality of protection would offset a principal objection to the White House-backed King-Anderson bill.

Another line of concern could be eased by changes in the certification procedure for hospitals and nursing facilities. Instead of having eligibility determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, that responsibility might well be left to the Joint Committee on Accreditation of the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association. This would further deflate the charge that the program represents a wedge for Federal rule of medicine.

Additional opportunity for give and take exists on such items as the amount and duration of benefits or the provision of a cash option for persons who prefer coverage under private health insurance. The problem here would be to guard against an excessive concentration of the poorest health risks in the Government pool, with an attendant distortion of its cost estimates. The need for a general program to help the aged pay their hospital and nursing home bills is now acknowledged by almost every faction in Congress; it will be a miscarriage of democracy if the session ends with nothing done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from New Jersey that it is my view that there are ways and means to devise a health care program under the terms of social security. The task of the legislature and the duty of the legislative body on such a serious issue as the one to which we refer is to find ways of making necessary accommodations and adjustments. The so-called King-Anderson bill, which I support in terms of its fundamental principles and provisions, is not sacrosanct. By that I mean it is not beyond some adjustment or some possible change that may improve its text and application. I understand that the Senator from New Jersey feels much in that same spirit. I am hopeful that before the Congress concludes its work at this session it will be able to pass a bill that will meet the test of social security financing and at the same time represent an improvement over the present bill.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I join wholeheartedly with the acting majority leader in that hope.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to make a statement concerning the Magnuson amendment which is pending before the Senate, to increase the amount of an appropriation in the pending bill from $2 million to $6 million.

I am unhappy with a good many sections of the Department of the Interior appropriation bill that has come from the Committee on Appropriations. I am unhappy about it because, in my judgment, a good many parts of the bill are unsound from the standpoint of sound public policy. The bill is unsound because parts of the bill represent a false economy at this time, and a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy.

I point out that the economy of our country is our most important defense weapon. The segment of our economy known as our natural resource areas is pretty vital to the destiny of this Republic.

The interests of our country can never be protected by economizing at the cost of its natural resources of our country. In too many sections, the bill would do exactly that. Yesterday there was a struggle on the floor of the Senate over an effort to strengthen the bill from the standpoint of returning, by way of rehabilitation of the range, the verdure of the western plains, by providing for improvements necessary to protect the water table of the great arid areas of the West. I say most respectfully that when it comes to consider appropriations such as the kind we are discussing, we should keep in mind the fact that a civilization does not climb on falling water tables.

The undeniable fact is that the water table is falling in some of the great arid sections of the West. There is need for reforestation. There is need for rangeland seeding. There is need for the development of water resources in those areas if we are to leave the heritage which we, as trustees, ought to leave to future generations of American boys and girls—God's gift of natural resources to us.

Senators have heard me say before in my years in the Senate that we have a moral obligation to see to it that our natural resources are left in a better condition than that in which we found them. But in my judgment, the bill pending before the Senate falls short of fulfilling that trust in several particulars. One particular relates to the rangeland issue which was discussed on the floor of the Senate yesterday. Another issue—and it is only one of several—is the issue with respect to which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is taking the lead. I am proud to join him as a cosponsor. The proposal would do something about providing the necessary access roads so that there may be an intelligent, scientific, and economic harvesting of the timber resources of our country. We are helping America move ahead again with these amendments. We are meeting the challenge of the New Frontier.

There are two or three points in regard to the need for the proposed increase of $2 million to $6 million which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recommending in regard to that particular item. I would have Senators keep in mind that for the past several weeks the Senate, through its Committee on Commerce, presided over by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], has been conducting public hearings in the field in regard to the depression that has hit the lumber industry of the United States. I am satisfied that I can say without fear of successful contradiction on the part of anyone in the Senate that there is no basic industry in the United States today that is as depressed as is the lumber industry. In the past 24 months several hundred lumber mills have closed their doors. Many of them have dismantled. The lumber market has gone awry. One of the reasons why the lumber market has gone awry is the Canadian competition with which the lumber producers in this country have been faced.

What has been presented to the lumber industry of this country is a competition, not against the lumber mills of Canada, but against the Government of Canada. We must face the fact that various forms of direct and indirect subsidy which the Canadian Government is supplying to the lumber industry of Canada is placing the lumber industry of this country in the doldrums, in a very serious depression. Canadian competition is adversely affecting the lumber producers of the United States.

At another time, as we will be discussing proposals that are bound to come out of these hearings, the facts will be presented to the Senate in regard to what the Canadian competition is doing to the lumber economy of this country.

Mr. President, come with me and sit with me for a moment as I describe to you what has happened in some of these public hearings in regard to the depressed economic condition of our lumber industry. Listen with me for a moment as I allude to the testimony of mayor after mayor, Governor after Governor, Republican and Democratic leaders in State after State; listen with me to the testimony of presidents of chamber of commerce after chamber of commence; listen with me to the testimony of labor leaders, of bankers, of merchants, of the lumber operators themselves. Listen with me as they all tell the same sad, depressing story, to the effect that the lumber industry of our own country is being gutted by the competition from Canada, aided and abetted by the various forms of governmental subsidy in Canada.

I am well aware of the importance of trade with Canada. No one need remind me that Canada is one of our best customers. I do want to raise my voice this afternoon, however, in defense of fair competition. I want to raise my voice this afternoon in defense of the proposition that our Government, through the allied agencies involved in the problem I am about to discuss in the pending bill, has a clear duty to see to it that we give the lumber industry of our country an equal break with Canadian mills, an equal opportunity to compete with Canadian mills. If we are to do that, as it is shown by witness after witness, who have testified by the reams in these public hearings, that something must be done, we will have to do something about the forestry programs and policies of the U.S. Government.

I now direct the attention of the Senate to some of the policies of the Forest Service particularly, although to some extent some of this applies also to the Bureau of Land Management. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has proposed an increase in the appropriations allowed in the bill for access roads from $2 million to $6 million. One might very well ask, What does the proposed increase have to do with the Canadian competition problem? I say it is of major importance in connection with the Canadian problem of competition. Why? Because, as the Senator from Washington has pointed out with undeniable proof, the Forest Service of the United States is not approaching the allowable cut in the sales which it offers to American lumber producers.

The allowable cut is a technical term. Although I need not do so for the information of the Senate, let me point out that by the allowable cut we refer to that figure of the amount of board feet of timber that can be cut out of a national forest in the interest of sound conservation, in the interest of a sound sustained yield program that will guarantee to future generations of Americans a continuity of timber supply, so that the time will never come when we will be a deforested country, as China has become. It represents the harvest of the annual growth of timber.

I digress to say that we must not forget that China was once a great country of forests. However, China forgot its obligations as a trustee to the Almighty that granted China great natural resources.

For some years, starting with that great crusader and conservationist, Gifford Pinchot, we have been working in this country for the protection of our forests, allowing only that cut that would assure a permanency to our forests, and a continuity of forest growth. We call it a sustained yield. There shall be sustained in our forests sufficient yield by way of fostering new growth and cutting only to that point where we can maintain that sustained yield. That is the allowable cut.

The Forest Service has not conducted its sales program so as to reach the allowable cut. That means a great waste.

I ask to place in the RECORD a table which shows how the mark has been missed in Oregon and Washington.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of financed cut and sell to actual cut and sell

[All figures rounded to million board feet]

OREGON

	Financed sell	Actual sell	Percent actual of financed	Financed cut	Actual cut	Percent actual of financed
Fiscal year 1959	2,429	2,827	116	2,326	2,544	109
Fiscal year 1960	2,994	2,694	90	2,334	2,847	122
Fiscal year 1961	2,841	2,514	88	2,918	2,409	83
Total, Oregon	8,264	8,035	97	7,578	7,800	103

WASHINGTON

Fiscal year 1959	1,373	1,552	113	1,208	1,107	92
Fiscal year 1960	1,796	1,131	63	1,216	1,348	111
Fiscal year 1961	1,794	1,300	72	1,597	1,167	73
Total, Washington	4,963	3,983	80	4,021	3,622	90

NOTE.—Small volumes in California from Rogue River and Siskiyou included in Oregon totals. Umatilla divided for financed sell: 90 percent Oregon, 10 percent Washington. Does not include timber advertised but not sold, or volume prepared and withheld from advertising.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Washington has already recited the national figures. This is a record that must be improved and improved at once. On top of this, the Forest Service must exert itself to make certain its allowable cuts are where they ought to be. On top of this, they must salvage timber not in the allowable cuts. They must develop more efficiency and supply less excuses.

Let no one get the idea that if we do not cut trees in a forest we protect the forest. As any forester will tell us, old trees overripen. Old trees become diseased. Old trees are more susceptible to insect plague. Old trees, if we are to have a healthy forest and a sustained-yield forest, must be cut.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has already put into the RECORD some very vital statistics in regard to this matter. I quote for emphasis what he has already said. He told the Senate:

> In fiscal year 1961 there was a terrible fall down in national forest timber sale performance. Only 77 percent of the timber offered for sale was sold. In the region represented by the Senators from California only 62 percent of financed timber was sold. In the Idaho-Montana region it was 79 percent. In the Oregon-Washington region 82 percent was sold. In the Rocky Mountain region—Colorado, South Dakota, and Wyoming—only 44 percent of the timber financed for sale was sold; and in Alaska a mere 31 percent was sold. The Lake States region—Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, and so forth—shows a record of only 64 percent sold. The record in previous years has sometimes been better and sometimes worse. It is a very spotty record. It must be improved starting right now.

We are confronted with the fact that a part of our lumber trouble is that our lumbermen cannot get logs offered for sale in sufficient amount so that the logs can be purchased in competition with the logs that are purchased by the Canadian mills from the Canadian Government. There are two facets to this problem of stumpage price.

The Forest Service will say that it puts the appraised value on the sale of logs. What happens many times, probably most of the time, is that the prospective buyers bid up the price at auctions under which Federal timber is sold. They bid up the price over and above the appraised value put on the lumber by the Forest Service. So the Forest Service has a tendency to wash its hands and ask, "What can we do about it? They are paying more for the logs than we had appraised them for if it had not been for the auction."

The fact is that the Forest Service does not tell the full story. I want it clearly understood that I severely criticize the Forest Service for what I consider to be a policy they have been following in regard to the sale of timber, a policy which is not in the public interest. Congress must make it perfectly clear to the Forest Service that there must be a halt in the policy of the Forest Service. I say to the taxpayers of America: Make clear to your politicians that you expect them to halt the unsound economic policy of the Forest Service. The time has come to call the Forest Service to an accounting for what I consider to be a shocking, wasteful policy which it has followed in regard to the allowable cut procedure.

There is no excuse for the Forest Service not having modernized and made realistic its allowable cut program. There is no excuse for denying to the lumber mills of the country the sales which would make it possible for them to buy, at prices which they can afford to pay, the necessary timber to operate the mills. It is the old story of supply and demand. We cannot legislate away the law of supply and demand. If the Forest Service does not modernize the allowable cut, if it permits less than the true allowable cut to be marketed, it limits supply. The problem is just that simple.

The Forest Service has been limiting the supply of standing timber available to the lumber mills of the country. That is one of the reasons why the prices have soared beyond the appraised value placed on the lumber by the Forest Service.

There is another facet of the problem, too. Suppose a man is a lumber mill operator and his mill is in the precincts of a national forest. He has competitors, and only so much timber is offered for sale. The amount falls far short of the allowable cut. The Forest Service has not done the job which, I submit, it is the clear duty of the Forest Service to do. It is the responsibility of the Forest Service to make certain that it offers the amount of logs which will make it possible to reach the allowable cut.

I submit a table on appraised and bid prices and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Bid versus appraised prices, advertised sales,*[1] *Pacific Northwest region, Oregon and Washington*

Calendar year	Douglas-fir region			Percent decrease [2]		Pine region			Percent decrease [2]	
	Appraised	Bid	Percent overbid	Appraised	Bid	Appraised	Bid	Percent overbid	Appraised	Bid
1959	20.22	27.42	135.6	100.0	100.0	14.05	16.55	117.8	100.0	100.0
1960	18.71	23.64	126.3	92.5	86.2	15.85	16.48	104.0	112.8	99.6
1961	14.98	20.04	133.8	74.1	73.1	10.82	12.50	115.5	77.0	75.5

[1] Summarized from National Forest Advertised Timber Sales, Region Six, a quarterly publication of region 6.
[2] Using 1959 prices as a base.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this table establishes the incontrovertible fact that spirited bidding continues despite the drop in appraisal rates.

The lumber mill operator must make a choice as to whether he will shut down his mill or will continue to operate the mill for some months at a sure loss. So he goes to the auction sale, and the bidding goes up, up, and up, because other mill operators are in the same predicament. He must decide which is the cheaper course of action to follow. Confronted with a loss, no matter which way he turns, he must decide whether it is cheaper for him to shut down his mill and sustain the loss of an idle mill, because merely shutting down the mill does not mean that it will not cost him to continue to own the mill. It is necessary to maintain the mill and pay the cost of insurance; and usually it is necessary to pay a higher premium on a vacant mill than on an operating mill. But that is frequently the situation and it is understandable. The maintenance of the mill and the costs of maintenance continue.

Then the mill operator is confronted with the probability that he will lose a large share of his labor force, because the labor force will not sit idly by, waiting for the economic climate to change. Much of the labor force will be lost to

other employers. So when the mill operator reaches a decision to reopen his mill, he will find that there is a short supply of labor.

All I am attempting to do is to paraphrase the testimony which was given to us by witness after witness from the lumber industry in the hearings which we have just closed throughout the country.

So the mill operators go to the auctions and decide they had better take a chance and bid more than they know the timber is then worth, in the hope that in the next 6, 10, or 12 months there will be a break in the lumber market and prices will go up, conditions will improve, and they can at least come close to breaking even, or at least sustain a loss which will be less than they would have suffered had they shut their mills down completely.

But they would not be in such a predicament if they received from the Forest Service the kind of treatment that they deserve. The record is perfectly clear, on the other hand, that one of the subsidies which the Canadian Government makes available to Canadian mills is to make certain that the Canadian mills are often able to buy timber from Canadian Government forests without competition, at a price alleged to be substantially lower than the price the American mills find it necessary to pay in heavy bidding for timber obtained from U.S. forests.

That is one of the great competitive advantages which Canadian mills have over U.S. mills. There are other advantages, but they are not pertinent to the discussion of the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Nevertheless, I shall allude to them so that the Senate will know I am talking about a total case, not merely a single segment in regard to a competitive disadvantage in which U.S. mills find themselves in relation to Canadian mills.

There are transportation costs. There is the question of the Jones Act, under which U.S. mills must ship in American bottoms, while Canadian mills can use the bottoms of the world. That is a very important question of policy which is not before the Senate this afternoon, although I shall discuss it in some detail when appropriate proposed legislation with respect to that situation comes before the Senate, I hope sometime within the next 30 days or sooner. Suffice to say now that we should not forget that the Jones Act is an act of many years standing on the statute books of the country. The Jones Act is the Merchant Marine Act. The Jones Act was passed in order to assure the American people that in time of war there would be an adequate merchant marine. It is true that there are not very many lumber ships left, but as Mr. Dewey, one of the ablest witnesses whom I heard at the lumber hearings, representing the merchant marine of the Nation, testified, we cannot start to say that we will make an exception for lumber ships. All ships are needed in time of war. But if we started to make an exception of those ships, even though there are only a few in number, plying between the east and west coasts, then, of course, the entire merchant marine policy of the Nation would be jeopardized, because other interests would then expect similar consideration.

We must face the fact, as I shall argue in detail with proof later, that the differential in the cost of shipping is, in fact, a defense cost. The fact that the U.S. Government requires lumber mills to ship their products in American bottoms really places upon the lumber mills the payment of a part of the defense cost of the country. That figure is easy to determine. It is easy to determine what the difference in transportation cost is between Vancouver, British Columbia, and Seattle, Wash., and New York City—from coast to coast—in U.S. bottoms as compared with foreign bottoms. The senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the senior Senator from Oregon, and other Senators are the sponsors of a bill which I hope will eventually be considered by the committee and will then come before the Senate, which will provide that the U.S. Government will pick up that differential, because it is a part of the defense cost of the country. It is as vital in the maintaining of a necessary merchant marine in time of war as an expenditure for any other defense weapon for which we spend millions of dollars; as vital, in my judgment, as a military plane or a missile, because defense must be dealt with from the standpoint of its totality. We cannot keep the country secure by providing only one defense weapon; we need the entire arsenal. So, Mr. President, that is also involved in this matter, in connection with Canada.

Canada has many transportation advantages and many other advantages. We can equalize the competition by means of the amendment the Senator from Washington proposes to increase the appropriation for access roads from $2 to $6 million. This is not a subsidy amendment. Every cent spent will come back to the Treasury.

The Canadian Government has seen to it that the Canadian operators can get out their lumber and that their allowable cut is made available to their mills. But the U.S. Government has not performed so well for the American lumber mills. The U.S. Government, through the Forest Service, has fallen far short of making available to the U.S. mills the allowable cut that a sound sustained-yield program would foster; and as I have indicated already, the Forest Service must be brought to task for this delinquency on the part of its administrative policies, and in my judgment the Federal Government must see to it that access to the timber is made available to the American mills.

Mr. President, accessibility is an issue for which I have battled for going on 18 years in the Senate. The first year when I was in the Senate, so the RECORD will show, I sponsored an access-roads bill; and every year since then I have stood on the floor of the Senate, as I do at this moment, pleading with the Senate and pleading with the Government to see to it that we build the needed access roads into the Federal timber, so that the timber can be brought out.

There are many reasons for building those roads, as I have said. Let me enumerate a few of them again:

The primary need, of course, is to make the allowable cut available to the lumber mills of the country. It does no good to have on a great mountainside a great stand of Federal forest if there is no road to the forest, to make it possible to get out the logs, once they are cut. There are all kinds of landlocked forests in this country, and I wish to talk about a landlocked-forest situation for which the U.S. Government is responsible. I am talking about the forests that are, in fact, landlocked because no roads reach them. We need roads going into these forests, in order to make it possible to get out the allowable cut.

I do not take any great satisfaction in the old alibi that one reason why the allowable cut does not get out of some forests is that there are no roads going into the forests. I ask, What did the last administration do? I have asked this many times in the past, "What were your budget requests for access roads?" The undeniable fact is that year after year the past administration simply did not ask for adequate funds with which to build access roads into the forests, in order to make it possible to get out the allowable cut.

I ask unanimous consent that a table be inserted which shows the results under the forest highway acts since 1953.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Authorization for forest development roads and trails during Eisenhower administration

Federal Aid Highway Act	Authorization for fiscal year	Authorization	
		Recommended by administration	Approved by Congress
1954	1956	$22,500,000	24,000,000
1954	1957	22,500,000	24,000,000
1956	1958	24,000,000	27,000,000
1956	1959	24,000,000	27,000,000
1958	1959	None	5,000,000
1958	1960	None	30,000,000
1958	1961	None	30,000,000
1960	1962	None	35,000,000
1960	1963	None	40,000,000
Total		93,000,000	242,000,000

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I take the position that the Forest Service is also a trustee of the forests of this country, as are the taxpayers of the United States. And the Forest Service has the clear duty to inform the people, year after year, how much money it needs for the construction of access roads, in order to make it possible to get out the allowable cut.

But we drag out the program year by year; and we insist, as the second boss of the Forest Service—for the Forest Service has two bosses: the executive branch and the Congress—and we put on the heat, so to speak, and we say to the Forest Service, "Tell us what you could spend efficiently and effectively in

accordance with your need to help you with the allowable-cut problem, if the money is appropriated." That is the money that some of us year after year have battled for, here on the floor of the Senate, as we are battling this afternoon; and I shall always be proud of my record in regard to this issue, for year after year I have proposed increases in the appropriations for access roads, over and above the appropriations originally recommended by the Forest Service, and over and above the recommendations made by the President—and that is true of all the Presidents under whom I have served, either Democratic or Republican. As a result of those battles—and, Mr. President, many of my colleagues in the Senate have joined me shoulder to shoulder in leading these fights—appropriations amounting to many millions of dollars have been made available for the construction of access roads, over and above what each of the administrations would have granted had we not reversed the Forest Service and the administrations in connection with the recommendations they made to the Congress.

Of course, we should not have had to make that fight; that is one fight which should have been unnecessary. And we should not have to be making this fight this afternoon. The Senate Appropriations Committee—and I speak most respectfully, but frankly, for I think the facts need to be brought out in the public record—in my judgment should not have brought to the floor of the Senate the recommendation of the administration or the recommendation of the Forest Service, because the recommendation of the administration and the recommendation of the Forest Service is demonstrably inadequate in order to provide a sound forest economy in this country for the next fiscal year; and I wish to say to this administration, although it is an administration of my party, "You simply cannot justify a false economy program at the expense of the natural resources of this country."

So we should have an access roads program appropriation of a minimum of $6 million, so that the Forest Service can get into some of the national forests and can obtain or build the roads that will make it possible to meet this demand from the lumber industry and from the business leaders of the areas of the country that are dependent upon a lumber economy for their prosperity.

When that is done, Mr. President, no one should labor under the misapprehension that the program is costing the taxpayers of the United States any money, for I have heard the chairman of the Appropriations Committee say many times, over the years—and he would say so today if the question were now put to him—that money spent for access roads is money well spent, because it returns to the U.S. Treasury many times the investment that is made.

I say to those in the timber industry who have built roads through the national forests to top their own timber—"You have a responsibility to make these roads available on reasonable terms." The fact that the roads are not available means sales are not made up to allowable cuts. This in turn forces high bidding and our operators engage in a vicious competition which the Canadians do not have.

When it is shown that much of the timber in a great national forest is overripe or is windblown or is disease-ridden, there is no economy in not proceeding to harvest those trees.

Likewise, Mr. President, if we want to have reforestation in the shortest possible time, we need to provide access to the forests, so that it will be possible to proceed scientifically to cut that forest, because scientific cutting will stimulate the regeneration and improvement of that forest. This may sound like a paradox, however, it is not.

So, Mr. President, one of the things this Government should do now, in meeting the plight of the lumber industry, and in meeting the problems in connection with Canadian competition—which is the result of the various forms of direct and indirect subsidy the Canadian Government is supplying their lumber mills—is to increase the appropriation so we can proceed to get the roads into our national forests that will make it possible to bring out the timber up to the allowable cut.

There are other problems in regard to the accessibility problem that grow out of lack of access roads, because I am not talking now about access roads only for getting timber out. I am talking about the need for access roads to save the timber now standing that is not ready for cutting. One of the great plagues that threatens the lumber industry is the plague of fire. Access roads are needed for fire protection. That need is easily demonstrable. Mr. President, I can take you into great national forest areas in this country where there is a good pattern of access roads, and I can take you to the supervisor of that forest, or to the regional forester of the Forest Service, and he will be my witness to tell you the great advantage to the reduction in the fire hazard that these roads have provided.

So when we are fighting here today for additional appropriations for access roads, we are fighting also for a preventive measure necessary to protect our forests from the ravages of fire.

There is another need for access roads, there is another need for accessibility, there is another need for what we call the multipurpose access road. There was a time when all that was built into a forest was a logging trail. Loggers went in and slashed down the trees and dragged them out over a logging trail. That practice led to great waste. It was found to be most uneconomic. So there has developed, as a matter of national policy, the so-called multiple-use road, a road that can be used for getting out the logs, a road that can be used for fire protection, a road that can be used for general public use, for the benefit of tourists and recreationists, a connecting road with great interstate highways.

How important that is in the great areas where the national forests exist. Take my State, for example. The No. 1 source, so far as our economic life is concerned, is lumber and agriculture, and then comes recreation. In my judgment, within 15 years, and possibly within 10 years, the greatest source of income for the State of Oregon will be income from so-called recreational sources. The great increase in tourism, the increase in leisure time, the increase in recreational activities are going to bring to the Pacific Northwest, and the whole West, for that matter, tens upon tens upon tens of thousands of tourists each year, including also the recreational activity of our indigenous population. But there must be roads. There must be accessibility.

Here again those of us who are fighting for the increased appropriation this afternoon are fighting for a strengthening of the economy of the United States. That is why I said, at the beginning of my remarks, that, in my judgment, this appropriation bill has too many sections in it that represent a false economy, a pennywise and pound-foolish policy; and this is one of them.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I am sure the Senator has already touched on the point about which I desire to inquire. Since it was impossible for me to be here earlier, I ask the Senator whether it is not so that additional money for access roads is merely taking money from one pocket in order to put that money back into another pocket.

Mr. MORSE. And more back in the other pocket.

Mr. CHURCH. Even more. Rather than representing a cost to the taxpayers, this is a method for opening up the necessary access roads to permit full and efficient harvesting of timber, but the added return on the sale of the timber will more than make up for the money spent to construct the roads.

Mr. MORSE. Many times over, and I have heard the chairman of the Appropriations Committee say that many times in the years I have been in the Senate.

Mr. CHURCH. Is it not also true that we have had insufficient money appropriated over the years to construct the number of access roads which a full and fair cut of our public timber clearly requires?

Mr. MORSE. That is true. Before the Senator came on the floor I was talking about the hearing held at Lewiston. The Senator sat there and heard business people, lumber people, labor people, and many public officials in his own State testify to this very point. They pointed out that, unless we do something about the allowable cut and the Forest Service gets up to the allowable cut—which it cannot do unless it has accessibility—the lumber industry of the great Pacific Northwest is going down and down to a further depth than it has already reached in competition with the Canadian mills that are not plagued with the kind of shortsighted government policy that the U.S. Government is extending, and has been extending for some years, to the lumber interests of this country.

Mr. CHURCH. I would like to comment on the Lewiston hearings in a mo-

ment, but first I should like to ask the Senator if there is not an inequity in failing to provide adequate money for access roads in that the Forest Service is required to place timber up for sale and to make a condition of the sale the construction of a road which falls to the operator to build, the cost of which is deducted from the proceeds of the sale, and thus in many cases limits the sale, for all practical purposes, to the large operators who are in a position to construct the roads, having both the capital and the equipment to do the job, but which discriminates against the smaller independent operators who do not.

Mr. MORSE. I am so glad the Senator has raised that point. It was one of the points I had intended to dwell on, and shall dwell on now. I wonder, if between the two of us, we cannot drive it home to the Senate, because if we can get the Senate to consider the matter, I do not see how it can limit us in the matter of access roads.

Let the record show what the short-sighted policy of the Forest Service has been in regard to the matter of access roads—and they have been aiding and abetting that policy, and I have been fighting it for a long time. They will put up a huge sale of timber, but put it up on condition that the purchaser of that timber is going to have to build an access road into the timber. Then the Forest Service lays down certain conditions that are going to have to be complied with in regard to the specifications for the road, and the cost is tremendous. No small operator can possibly buy the timber under those conditions.

What we do is exclude the small businessman in the American timber industry from the purchase of the timber. Do we save any money? We certainly do not, because the purchaser of the timber buys the timber, as the Senator from Idaho has pointed out, subject to building the road, and he is allowed to deduct the cost of the road from the purchase price he pays.

One may ask the question, "Can't the small fellow do that?" The answer is, "No," because it takes money to swing a deal like that. They have to pay a terrific sum of money on the line when they buy the timber. They have to float the financing for roads that may cost thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars a mile.

Senators would be surprised to learn the costs of some of these roads up the sides of mountains.

So, in effect, the Government is building the roads through the big lumber operators.

I have gone through this battle many times. There is also no question that the U.S. Government, under the Corps of Engineers, under governmental supervision, could build the roads more cheaply. There is no doubt about the fact that the access roads which the Federal Government does build, by and large, are built cheaper than those which are built by the lumber operators themselves. So we lose at every turn in this matter. The people who end up losing all are the little operators.

One of the ironies in this situation, I say to the Senator from Idaho, is that we as Senators appropriate huge sums of money for small business programs. We have provided for setting up a Small Business Administration. God bless it. I think it is doing a great job. We are very inconsistent in our government policies. This is a small business aid we could give to small lumber mills in this country if we gave them access to the forests, making the forests more available to them, instead of shutting them out in sale after sale.

These men come before the committees of Congress, as the Senator knows, and this is one of the great criticisms they express. They say, "We do not have an equal break with the big boys."

Mr. CHURCH. Access roads are an aid we could supply to small business, which would not cost the Treasury a dime.

Mr. MORSE. It would make the Government some money.

Mr. CHURCH. It might very well.

Mr. MORSE. It would make the Government some money.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the Senator's position. It is squarely based upon the facts. It represents good public policy.

The Senator has referred to the hearings at Lewiston. It was not coincidental that most of the small operators who appeared at those hearings laid particular emphasis upon the importance of increasing appropriations for access roads.

The large operators, in all fairness, are very important to the economy of the West. I have no argument against any of them, as the Senator knows. Nevertheless, I think it is in the general interest to administer our public forests in such a way that the small operator will not be forced out, so that the independent lumberman will have an opportunity to participate in the purchase of public timber, and the essence of free enterprise in the lumber business—which I take it to be individual entrepreneurship—will not be lost.

I think it would be a calamity even for the big operators, let alone for the public interest, if the time ever should come when the national forests in the Northwest become merely gigantic tree farms for two or three great corporate entities.

Mr. MORSE. I could not agree more with the Senator. I know many of the large operators and I have worked closely with them. Large operator after large operator has said to me, "Get in there and fight as hard as you can for increased appropriations for access roads, because they are vital to the industry."

These men would much prefer to be relieved of the headache of building the roads. I speak for the overwhelming majority of them. They would much prefer to be relieved of the operation of building the roads. It is a pretty difficult administrative job. It is costly for them.

The Government, in regard to the supervision and building of access roads, is in a much better position to do the job more economically.

Not only at Lewiston, but also at Portland and at Olympia, and wherever hearings have been held, I think access roads would have to be named as the No. 1 recommendation of the operators in order to help them meet competition with Canada, since that would meet the question of the allowable cut. That would take away from the Forest Service any excuse at all for not reaching the allowable cut, and would make it possible for lumber operators to buy stumpage, because of the law of supply and demand, at a low price.

Mr. CHURCH. The Senator has been exceedingly objective in his comments. He has pointed out, quite rightly, that this is not an issue which divides the big and small operators, in the sense that the big operators oppose the amendment now pending.

Rather, it is essential to the well-being of the entire industry that the access road program be expanded. The big operators in my State have joined with the small, independent operators to urge increased appropriations of funds for this purpose.

I conclude by saying that the hearings at Lewiston, which I requested and attended, ably chaired by the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], demonstrated beyond any shadow of a doubt that the lumber industry in the Northwest is faced with the most critical problem to confront it in a great many years. The Senator is quite correct when he says that the essence of the problem is Canadian competition.

I do not for a moment pretend that the amendment now being considered represents a full answer to the problems facing our lumber industry. However, the hearings at Lewiston demonstrated—from more than 100 witnesses, from small and large concerns alike, who came to testify concerning the severity of their problem—that appropriations for access roads need to be increased. Larger appropriations need to be approved. This is one of the steps open to the Congress which can be most helpful to a very hard-pressed industry.

I do not remember a time, since the great depression, when a larger number of men have been unemployed in the north woods of Idaho than today. The Government and the Congress must take cognizance of the severity of our problem and must take steps, with dispatch to alleviate this depressed condition, insofar as the Government can. Today we can take one important step in that direction.

I commend the Senator from Oregon for his address. I am happy to be a cosponsor of the amendment. I am hopeful that the Senate today will approve the amendment for the benefit of a sick industry in the West which desperately needs our help.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Idaho very much for the very fine contribution he has made to this debate.

Mr. President, before I close I wish to say to the Senator from Arizona, who has seen the situation develop, that I have only one more topic to discuss in connection with my case in support of the amendment. That is the topic which involves American foreign policy in relation to the amendment.

I say most respectfully that in my judgment the Appropriations Committee, in bringing the bill to the Senate, over-

looked some of the implications the bill bears to American foreign policy, for the reasons I shall discuss under my last topic.

Mr. President, I have one other topic to discuss in connection with my support of the Magnuson amendment. I wish to discuss it from the standpoint of some foreign policy implications.

Some may ask offhand, "What in the world does the amendment have to do with American foreign policy?"

My answer is, "More than one might think."

In the first place, there is the point already brought out in my colloquy with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], in connection with the first major point that I made in my argument today. We have a very serious problem with Canada. We have a very serious problem in regard to the question of competition with Canada in the lumber field, resulting from the subsidization by the Canadian Government in various ways of Canadian mills, to the detriment of American mills, which competition has resulted in the closing of several hundred American mills and has thrown out of work many American workers.

I am one Senator who does not intend to sit in the Senate and support his Government in a policy that amounts, in fact, to exporting jobs to Canada.

Here is one Senator who does not intend to sit in the Senate and support a U.S. Government policy that in effect amounts to liquidating a large segment of the economy of his State.

Here is one Senator who warns the President of the United States today that he will be in trouble if he does not proceed to take the necessary steps to see to it that a Government policy that discriminates against a segment of our own country to the benefit of an economy in another country is stopped.

The problem permeates the entire administration—and it is my administration. I yield to no one in support of the present administration when I am satisfied that the administration is following a policy that is in the national interest. We have a right to look to our administration for some remedy. For many months the administration's attention has been called to the problem. From the floor of the Senate today I ask the President of the United States, "When are you going to insist that the Departments of your Government that have jurisdiction over this subject do something about it?" I shall continue to follow where the facts lead on the issue.

It is within its administrative power and jurisdiction to handle much of this problem without any legislation at all, although I intend to support some legislation in regard to it, too. I intend to support the Magnuson-Morse bill in regard to the modification of the Jones Act. I intend, if my administration forces the issue, to support legislation, although it may not pass in this session of Congress. I want the American voters to pass judgment on it in November 1962. I shall support legislation, if this administration does not stop a policy of discriminating against the lumber industry of this country, that will place a temporary quota on Canadian timber—a fair quota, a quota that will not discriminate against Canada, but a quota that will even the balance of competition, a quota which has been proposed by witness after witness in lumber hearing after lumber hearing, a quota which will take into consideration the historic pattern of Canadian imports into the United States from Canada for the past 10 years, for example, and, after the imports reach that level, assess upon all imports that flow into the United States following that point a quota tariff that will put them on a par with the U.S. mills. Such quota tariff would continue until this administration and this Government take the necessary steps to give our timber industry the relief that it deserves.

I fully appreciate the import of what I have said in the past 2 minutes. This is the place to say it.

This administration made clear when it first proposed its so-called foreign trade bill that it did not propose or intend to follow a foreign trade program that would do irreparable injury to American industry. This administration has seen fit—and I supported it—to provide protection on a fair and equitable basis, but not a discriminatory basis, with respect to the textile industry. I ask, "Mr. President, do you consider the textile industry of greater import than the great timber resources of this Nation?"

I supported the President when the textile amendment was before the Senate. I opposed the Mundt amendment, which would have prevented the textile agreement from going into effect, by being one of the supporters of the Humphrey-Morse amendment as a substitute. It placed upon the President the responsibility of proceeding to determine the facts in regard to the items which the Senator from South Dakota had included in his amendment—beef, lamb, poultry, timber products, and dairy products. I said then, as I say now, that the obligation of the administration is to find out what the facts are, to find out what steps can be taken administratively, or what may be needed legislatively in order to prevent the same kind of irreparable injury that the administration was so anxious to prevent in regard to the textile industry.

I would not even want to suggest that political power might have anything to do with the textile amendment, although there are some who have that suspicion. I propose to face these problems on the basis of the facts on each issue. The facts supported Senators from the textile producing States. I also point out that the facts support Senators from the lumber producing States.

We are not trying to prevent trade with Canada, but we are saying that our Government cannot justify a trade program which permits the lumber industry of this country to be placed at a discriminatory disadvantage because of aid in the form of a subsidy in one way or another by the Canadian Government to the Canadian lumber industry.

Let me put it this way, because it is basic in my economic philosophy. I believe the U.S. Government—and I would like to have my administration start doing it—has the responsibility of protecting the private enterprise system in the United States. The Government does not protect the private enterprise system when it countenances giving a discriminatory advantage to an industry in another country which is the beneficiary of the largess of a subsidy by a foreign government.

This principle is not limited to Canada. The lumber situation merely illustrates the problem. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I know that the problem arises around the globe. In my judgment, we have reached a point in the field of foreign aid where our Government must be called to account by the voters of this country, if necessary, in regard to placing the American private enterprise system at a discriminatory disadvantage in relation to competitive industries abroad which are subsidized, not only by foreign governments abroad, but also by the U.S. Government itself.

The time has come, as I said on the floor of the Senate last Friday, when I discussed another phase of the foreign trade program and policy, for us to take a long, hard look at the economic effects of some of our foreign aid programs in relation to our own industry. The time has come when we must cease pouring out of the Treasury of the United States the resources of taxpayers of the United States for strengthening industries in other countries, some of which have already reached the point where they can stand on their own feet. They should be asked to stand on their own feet. We have heard much about the Common Market program. I believe that the European Common Market is good for Europe and good for the world. I recognize that we cannot turn back the hands of the clock. However, we must follow certain courses of action to protect our own industry. That is why I said last Friday—and I was so glad to have the majority leader discuss at least certain facets of this problem in his notable speech of last Sunday in Michigan—that we must take a look at the foreign aid program to see what some of the effects are on the greatest defense weapon the United States has, which is the private enterprise economy.

That is why I said then, and say now, that we must ask our NATO allies, "When are you going to start to pay your share of the bill?" We must say to our allies, "You are now enjoying a prosperity and an economic stability the like of which you did not even enjoy before World War II."

Most of our NATO allies are in a better economic position today than they were before World War II.

They got there because of us. They got there because, in large measure, we rebuilt them—and should have. I supported those programs. I supported the NATO Treaty. I supported the Marshall plan. I supported the point 4 program. But we supported them in order to help those countries return to economic stability and prosperity. Many of them have reached that point. Yet we con-

tinue to pour millons of dollars into them. It ought to stop. The senior Senator from Oregon serves notice that he proposes to vote to stop it whenever he has a chance to vote to stop it. That does not mean I will not vote for foreign aid, but I shall vote for selective foreign aid, not blanket foreign aid.

So bound up in this amendment in the Senate this afternoon, which proposes to raise the appropriation for access roads from $2 million to $6 million, is a very important symbolic foreign policy problem. This particular amendment is necessary in order to put our lumber industry in a position where it can compete on a plane of equality with Canadian mills. It will do that by getting roads built into the national forests so that the Forest Service can permit the allowable cut, which will enable our mills to have the supply of timber which will make it unnecessary for them to bid up the price, far beyond the value of the timber, so far as making a profit on it is concerned, when they manufacture it into lumber.

The amendment also has this importance: It is symbolic because it can very well be the beginning of a major foreign policy debate in the Senate, to which the American people will respond and in regard to which I am satisfied they will, once they become acquainted with the facts, serve notice on this administration that the so-called foreign-trade bill must be worked out in a manner which will not do irreparable damage to American industry. If we make conditions more difficult for American business, we cannot have competition with the Common Market; we cannot have competition with the efficient mills elsewhere in the world—and the interesting thing is that the United States has helped to build those mills, and we deserve credit for it. I am not asking that American business be given a preferential position. My faith in the private enterprise system is such that I believe it can compete with the operation of a factory or industry in any other country, if that industry is not the recipient of either a government subsidy of that nation or a government subsidy of the United States.

So I want my administration to know that the Magnuson amendment, more than the administration may ever have thought, is symbolic of what I believe is an onrushing foreign policy debate in this country. The people will reverse the Kennedy administration, unless the Kennedy administration takes note, before it is too late, that the American people do not intend to continue to support a foreign-aid program of a blanket nature, which results, in effect, in the exportation of millions of American jobs out of the United States into foreign lands. I want to be put in a position where I can support it. But I want the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to take note that neither he nor any other Member of the Senate can ignore the direct relationship between the Magnuson amendment and the problem of Canadian competition in lumber.

That is a foreign policy problem, and I respectfully say that we have had no evidence from the Committee on Appropriations that they gave due consideration to this problem when they reported to the Senate an inadequate recommendation of only $2 million for forest access roads.

I come to my final point on foreign policy in relation to this problem, and then I shall close. It will be of interest to the taxpayers to know how many millions of their dollars have been spent in the underdeveloped areas of the world for the building of access roads there. I am sure it will be of interest to them to take note of the facts. Although we have spent many millions of dollars for highway construction in many parts of the world, sadly enough some of that construction has been completely wasted; sadly enough, some of those highways are standing practically unused; sadly enough, some of those highways have been built into areas where they never should have been built in the first place.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the Magnuson amendment is symbolic. In my opinion, it is the opening shot in an attack on a shortcoming of American foreign policy. If we really want to protect American jobs, if we really want to put the American lumber industry in a better position, so that it can compete without the discriminatory advantage which the Canadian lumber mills presently enjoy, let us vote for the Magnuson amendment, because I think it is a sound amendment from whatever angle the subject is approached.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I listened with great interest and sympathy to the eloquent statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and to the most enlightening colloquy between the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] and the Senator from Oregon on the same subject. They and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] have provided the Senate with a nucleus for many discussion points on matters in which the governmental agencies charged with utilizing our forest resources are directly concerned.

They suggest among other valuable comments that the Forest Service timber sale program needs a more thorough inspection. They believe that the Forest Service has an obligation to offer for sale the full amount of timber that the budget plan incorporates. Senator MAGNUSON points out, most properly, that if circumstances arise which prevent full sale schedules of timber that the Congress should, indeed must, be advised.

We of the Western States depend heavily on our forest resources. I do not at this moment in history include as exactly in the same category in every respect my State of Alaska in this group for the Alaskan forest industry is just starting to grow. Our first pulp mill is only 8 years old. But our Alaska timber resources still have enormous potential and, given a fair opportunity to grow, should one day provide a major source of income within the State and of materials for the whole Nation. The vast wealth of Alaska's timber is as yet largely untapped.

More important, it needs intelligent and practical evaluation. Millions of board feet in Alaska are wasting each year because forest access roads have not been constructed. Fire, disease, insect infection, and perhaps man-made policies take their toll. Yet within the vast State of Alaska, an area one-fifth the size of the other States of the Nation combined, stand 1 trillion board feet of timber.

Think of it. Timber to house those who seek new homes. Timber from which to build furniture for the many needs of construction. Timber from which to manufacture all kinds of products required in the contemporary world.

Senator MAGNUSON points to the fact that in Alaska in fiscal year 1961 a mere 31 percent of the timber offered for sale was sold.

I can appreciate the problems the Forest Service faces in Alaskan sales. Few mills operate. Transportation facilities are minimal.

For a century Alaska has suffered from a lack of adequate transportation opportunities. Discrimination in the apportionment of Federal funds kept from the State opportunity to build even the scantiest of interlocking roads. The long haul today over the Alaska Highway which connects my State with Washington State is not a fast means of transportation. Senator MAGNUSON and I, as members of the Alaska International Highway Commission, legislation to create which he sponsored in 1938, played a part in securing that highway, though the route was not the one we favored.

When the Canadian Prince Rupert-Whittier Sea Train Barge started operation this past month it appeared to many that a new and less expensive system of transportation of goods into Alaska would correct part of Alaska's transportation ills.

The sea train barge would compete with the service of the Alaska Steamship Corporation operating out of Seattle and the competition would decrease freight rates. That was the assumption.

This still may take place and I hope it does. Competition can help Alaska. Anything that helps reduce the high freight rates which burden Alaska and are a major cause of Alaska's high living costs, is desirable.

But competition can unwittingly hurt Alaska. The sea barge has brought to the State a new ill.

Last month the first sea train rail barge brought 780,000 board feet of Canadian timber to the port at Whittier. That lumber was destined for markets in the rail belt which extends from Seward on the Pacific coast, through Anchorage and Palmer to Fairbanks.

Ironically, the timber, following arrival in the State, can be sold for less than the rate for which it is today produced by mills within the State. Moreover, it caused the reopening of the abandoned military port of Whittier, which, built in wartime by the Federal Government, solely for defense reasons, now threatens to compete disastrously with the ports of Seward and Anchorage.

The Alaska Lumbermen's Association has asked the Alaskan delegation to see if the U.S. Government can impose a

temporary quota on the flood of softwood lumber from Canada on a quarterly basis to remain in effect while a long-term solution is being explored by the several agencies of government involved.

Association President Milton J. Daly, of Ketchikan, says the mills in the State cannot stand the new competition to their limited and highly seasonal local markets.

This new development will not increase the sale of domestic timber. It will not encourage development of new mills and it may discourage two which are planned.

No one condemns the action of the Canadian lumber interests. It is their business to find and develop new markets.

But this new threat to an industry not yet out of babyhood can only add to the problems of the U.S. Forest Service, the Federal Government generally, and the citizens of Alaska particularly.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a letter I have received from the Alaska Lumbermen's Association describing this problem in detail.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KETCHIKAN SPRUCE MILLS,
Ketchikan, Alaska, June 5, 1962.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: In confirming my wire to you of date, am attaching the full text of the wire sent to President Kennedy on May 9 by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association expressing the association's viewpoint on Canadian lumber imports.

We in the lumber industry in Alaska have previously been affected only indirectly by the importation of Canadian lumber into the south 48 through such price effects as it caused, which, in the last 2 years were serious enough. A small quantity of Canadian lumber has been trucked up the highway in recent years, but not in such substantial volume to concern the Alaskan milling industry.

We are presently very much alarmed, however, at the initial movement of 780,000 feet board measure of lumber from Prince George arriving at Whittier via the first rail barge last month. That the Canadians are aggressively serious in this matter is without question as we know that additional movements are scheduled. Further, our company has had many conversations with representatives of the Canadian exporting firm and we know that favorable rail rates from Prince George and Dawson Creek to Rupert, as well as favorable sea train rates from Prince Rupert to Whittier, were established by the Canadian National Railway to make this movement possible. As an example, reduction of the former Prince George to Rupert rate of 80-odd cents a hundredweight to a through rate portion, for this part of the haul, of 46 cents a hundredweight for 80,000-pound cars is substantial Government assistance.

The interior Canadian plants pay a base labor rate of $1.78 per hour compared to our Ketchikan base rate of $2.55. Their freight rate by rail to Anchorage is $36 per thousand feet compared to our $31.50 per thousand, but they have the benefit of $4.50 per thousand in exchanging the American funds to Canadian currency, which makes their freight rate the same as ours. To Fairbanks, their rate is lower than ours, as they enjoy a through rate on the Canadian National Railways and the Alaska Railroad, where we, in barging to Anchorage, have to pay a local rail rate from Anchorage to Fairbanks.

The Alaska rail belt market is of such small size that the entrance of another substantial lumber source into and participating therein will have a demoralizing effect on most of the mills in both westward and southeastern Alaska, as the majority of us depend substantially or wholly upon that market. It is just not good for Alaskan economy at this stage of development.

Any help you can give the industry here through assisting the position taken by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association will be deeply appreciated by all Alaskan operators, I am sure.

Sincerely,

MILTON J. DALY.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if we are to meet the competition we face, then each contributor to our economy must function in a modern fashion. The U.S. Forest Service must meet its timber sale commitments and it must modernize its allowable cuts procedures. As the Senator from Washington has said:

> Timber sales plans should be made early and available for local mills to plan on.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] likewise believes that Forest Service procedure can and should be improved.

Timber sales must be made regularly.

The timber which can be cut and marketed must be made available. Each of the States should be selling nearly to capacity.

Reforms in sales procedure must be made.

Bureau of the Budget planners must have better working tools.

Advance planning is needed.

The Congress generally and the Appropriations Committee specifically must know what is needed if Congress is to help meet the demands and needs. Senator MAGNUSON's suggestion that the Forest Service give to the Congress a meaningful annual report is sound. If it becomes necessary to transfer funds, this should be done.

We cannot sit idly as our natural resources spoil. Therefore, I am delighted to have this opportunity to express my thoughts about proper timber management and to commend highly the remarks which have been made by my colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], in calling attention to the plight of the lumber industry, which is an important segment for our national economy.

Alaska has more acreage set aside in national forests than any other State in the Union—20,742,224 acres. Yet less funds are expended per acre in my State than in any other State, a mere, paltry 23 cents per acre.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a State-by-State tabulation of per acreage expenditures be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total allocation

State	Total acreage	Dollars	Per acre
Alabama	631,772	2,720,500	$4.27
Alaska	20,742,224	4,856,800	.23
Arizona	11,381,561	9,372,900	.82
Arkansas	2,405,030	5,579,400	2.32
California	19,963,359	46,245,400	2.32
Colorado	14,350,487	10,871,100	.76
Connecticut		146,400	
Delaware		49,000	
District of Columbia		7,477,900	
Florida	1,074,758	3,281,800	3.05
Georgia	786,438	3,692,900	4.70
Hawaii		147,400	
Idaho	20,349,401	24,504,000	1.20
Illinois	211,013	1,112,600	5.27
Indiana	121,930	567,000	4.65
Iowa	5,296	155,300	29.32
Kansas	107,114	135,850	1.27
Kentucky	459,084	1,954,200	4.26
Louisiana	591,566	3,351,900	5.67
Maine	50,021	886,800	17.73
Maryland		781,700	
Massachusetts	1,651	303,900	184.07
Michigan	2,559,412	5,283,700	2.06
Minnesota	2,787,407	7,264,700	2.61
Mississippi	1,133,973	6,818,900	6.01
Missouri	1,374,573	2,592,100	1.89
Montana	16,635,730	16,233,500	.98
Nebraska	339,716	422,500	1.24
Nevada	5,058,028	1,499,200	.30
New Hampshire	677,559	1,627,700	2.40
New Jersey		266,100	
New Mexico	8,997,993	6,582,900	.73
New York	13,747	843,100	61.33
North Carolina	1,124,152	3,908,800	3.48
North Dakota	1,104,850	658,900	.60
Ohio	106,655	1,300,700	12.20
Oklahoma	267,883	1,850,600	13.18
Oregon	14,938,806	43,731,400	2.93
Pennsylvania	470,869	1,970,700	4.19
Rhode Island		79,000	
South Carolina	587,273	2,710,800	4.62
South Dakota	2,004,004	2,772,000	1.38
Tennessee	595,982	2,044,200	3.43
Texas	775,263	2,948,100	3.80
Utah	7,922,001	8,622,100	1.09
Vermont	231,901	905,900	3.91
Virginia	1,448,815	3,260,900	2.25
Washington	9,668,619	22,488,500	2.33
West Virginia	903,982	2,519,800	2.79
Wisconsin	1,468,743	6,848,100	4.66
Wyoming	9,144,255	5,693,100	.62

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, these figures are just another example of how, despite statedhood, the encrusted habits and practices of the colonialism which Alaska suffered during its 92 years under the flag, first as a District, then as a Territory, but always as a stepchild in the national family, persist. Equality in the apportionment of U.S. Forest Service funds, so that more forest access roads could be built would be one essential step toward rectifying Alaska's logging and timber problems.

A temporary tariff or quota for Canadian lumber would be another.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am for Senator MAGNUSON's forest roads amendment because the small- and medium-size lumber operators in California and other States need access to available national forest timber. The larger operators of the industry which own forest land in front of or mixed with ripe national forest timber have both access and timber. But the smaller ones very often do not—unless the Government controls more access roads to reach the available forest cut. Given equal access opportunity, small- and medium-size units of the industry will have equal opportunity to bid on timber sales to a larger degree than is now possible.

The Forest Service is working on an urgent program of acquiring privately owned roads totaling in cost more than

$6 million for the portion of road ownership which is properly the Government's share. This is a road acquisition program not a road-building program; these are existing roads over which privately owned timber has been hauled out of the forests. It is good business for the Government to buy quickly into ownership of these privately owned roads because it increases the value of the Government timber. Furthermore, the purchase of existing roads can be completed much more rapidly than the construction of duplicating road systems. The $2 million put in by the Senate committee is not enough. We need the additional $4 million proposed by the Magnuson amendment. It is my understanding, because of the large area of national forests in California and the nature of the allowable timber cut in relation to existing roads, that approximately one-fourth of the access road expenditures would be made in my State.

Another important additional benefit which would accrue would be to open up to the general public the use of large areas of national forest land. This recreational benefit is not to be overlooked. We have a particular need in California, and I am sure in other States, to provide accommodations for the increasing number of people who are seeking outdoor recreation, hunting and fishing on public lands.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the yeas and nays have not been ordered on my amendment. I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have no more to add to what has already been said about the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY PARLIAMENTARIANS FROM NIGERIA

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in Nigeria, the most populous country of Africa, freedom is flowering under a people whose institutions stem from the same heritage of which our people are so proud. It is a diversified country, a large country, devoting great effort to education—a country whose laws, whose system, and whose tenets of faith promote, protect, and defend the dignity of the individual.

In Nigeria we see great promise of growth and development, not only in economics but also in political and social fields.

Today we are favored with a visit by a delegation from the Parliament of Nigeria. There are four Senators and four Members of the House of Representatives, including the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Members of the Senate of Nigeria are:

The Honorable Dennis Chuhude Osadebay;

The Honorable Dahlton O. Asemota;

The Honorable Zanna Medalla Sheriff; and

The Honorable Chief Z. C. Obi.

The Members of the House of Representatives of Nigeria are:

The Honorable Ibrahim Jalo Waziri;

The Honorable E. C. Akwiwu;

The Honorable Chief O. B. Akin-Olugbade; and

The Honorable Muhammadu Sagir Umar.

Also the Honorable J. M. Udochi, Ambassador of Nigeria, and Mr. J. O. Adeigbo, staff assistant to the Nigerian delegation.

I ask Senators to join me in welcoming the distinguished delegation from Nigeria, a country which has demonstrated its friendship for the United States and for Western ideals, including freedom, to which we are devoted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). On behalf of the Senate, the Chair welcomes our distinguished guests.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair in order that Senators may greet our guests.

There being no objection, at 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled on being called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. METCALF in the chair).

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Washington will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$6,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, is this amendment a substitute for language in the committee version of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I merely propose to add $4 million to the amount. The amendment is only to the amount involved. No new language at all is proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the amendment, it would strike out the figure "$2,000,000," and would insert in lieu thereof the figure "$6,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand it, the amendment, by means of which the Senator from Washington proposes to insert the language between lines 8 and 13, does constitute legislation.

I should like to propound the following parliamentary inquiry: Does a point of order lie against the Magnuson amendment which proposes to change the dollar figure, or will a point of order lie after the Magnuson amendment has been adopted? Would the language between lines 8 and 13 be subject to a point of order after the adoption of the Magnuson amendment, or would the point of order be affected by the action of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair correctly understands the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair states that if the Senate were to adopt the Magnuson amendment, thus changing the figure from $2 million to $6 million, the $6 million would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then, Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Magnuson amendment and the language which it proposes to insert is legislation, and therefore is out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair overrules that point of order. The Magnuson amendment is not legislation. It merely would increase the amount from $2 million to $6 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I desire to propound a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. After the Magnuson amendment has been acted upon, since the rest of the language obviously is legislation, if a point of order is made against the language after the Magnuson amendment has been acted upon and if that point of order is sustained, then will the $6 million figure be stricken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the committee amendments were agreed to en bloc, but points of order in connection with them were not waived. Therefore, the Senator from Delaware can raise a point of order as to the rest of the amendment at any time he may choose to do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I so understand. But if the Magnuson amendment is adopted and if the figure is changed from $2 million to $6 million and the point of order is then made, it will strike out the entire section?

Mr. MAGNUSON. My understanding is that the Senator from Delaware can make a point of order against the entire section, regardless of the amount involved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that is the way I understand the situation. It makes no difference whether the amount

is $6 million or $50 million; the language of the amendment—but not the amount—is, in any case, subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The Chair finds it very difficult to rule in advance upon a point of order to be submitted at a future time by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think the Chair might assuage the concern of the Senator from Delaware if the Chair stated that regardless of whether the Magnuson amendment is adopted or is rejected, the right of the Senator from Delaware to make the point of order will not in anywise be affected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will give that assurance to the Senator from Delaware; namely, regardless of whether this amendment is adopted or is rejected, the action of the Senate on the amendment will not affect the right of the Senator from Delaware to make a point of order to the language as legislation in a general appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As to this language?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, a point of order as to the language of this section—as to whether it is legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct—that is to say, lines 8 through 13, inclusive, on page 31 of the bill. In other words, I shall have the same right to make the point of order after the Magnuson amendment is acted upon that I have at this time. The reason I press this point is that earlier I had been advised differently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then I have no objection to having the Magnuson amendment voted on first.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my amendment be withdrawn.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, Mr. President; let us proceed to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment of the Senator from Washington. Before the vote is taken, I think it should be pointed out that in connection with this particular proposal the Bureau of the Budget requested only $2 million. The House rejected even the Budget request for $2 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee did include $2 million, which was the Budget request. Now the Senator from Washington proposes, through an amendment, to increase that amount by an additional $4 million—thus constituting a $4 million increase over the amount of the Budget request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on that basis I think the amendment should be rejected, but I am willing to have the vote taken at this time on its merits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. If present and voting the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is detained on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 41, as follows:

[No. 86 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Allott	Gruening	Monroney
Anderson	Hart	Morse
Bartlett	Hartke	Neuberger
Bible	Hayden	Pastore
Burdick	Hill	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Randolph
Cannon	Jackson	Scott
Carroll	Kefauver	Smith, Mass.
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	Sparkman
Church	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Dodd	Magnuson	Wiley
Dworshak	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McCarthy	Yarborough
Engle	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Metcalf	

NAYS—41

Beall	Fong	Murphy
Bennett	Goldwater	Pearson
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Butler	Hruska	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Robertson
Capehart	Jordan	Russell
Case, N.J.	Keating	Saltonstall
Cooper	Kerr	Smathers
Cotton	Lausche	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Long, La.	Talmadge
Dirksen	McClellan	Thurmond
Douglas	Miller	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Moss	Young, Ohio
Ervin	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—12

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Bush	Hickey	Morton
Carlson	Holland	Muskie
Chavez	Johnston	Tower

So Mr. MAGNUSON's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. ANDERSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to have the attention of the distinguished Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I had requested recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington was recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suggest an amendment which might be acceptable, on behalf of the committee members. I suggest that on line 9, under the heading of "Access Roads" we strike out the words, "acquiring by condemnation or otherwise," and change the amount so that the language would read:

For additional roads needed for access to national forest lands in carrying out the Act of June 4, 1897, as amended (16 U.S.C. 471, 472, 475, 476, 551), $6,000,000.

And then to strike out the words: "to remain available until expended."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington suggested striking out the language not at present authorized by law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The language which would remain is authorized by law, and there would be no question about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I so move, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Presiding Officer to the language of the bill, on page 31, beginning on line 8, under the title "Access Roads," down to and including line 13.

I make a point of order that this language constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, and I make the point of

order that that language should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have made a motion. I have made a motion to modify the language against which the Senator from Delaware is making a point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I make a point of order, Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. A motion is pending.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. A motion may be pending, but a point of order is in order at any time; and I am making the point of order at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is correct. The point of order has to be ruled upon in advance of the vote on the motion offered by the Senator from Washington. The Senator from Delaware is in order in making the point of order.

This language is obviously legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is the formal amendment, Mr. President. I wish to address myself to the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington now offer an amendment?

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is the amendment I suggested before, in writing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 31, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

ACCESS ROADS

For additional roads needed for access to national forest lands in carrying out the Act of June 4, 1897, as amended (16 U.S.C. 471, 472, 475, 476, 551), $6,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the point of order, so that the Senate will understand it. I suggested that we change the language. I am sure the members of the Committee on Appropriations will agree it should be changed, so that the language will not be subject to a point of order. The suggested language would carry out existing law, the act of June 4, 1897.

The Senate concurred in my amendment to increase the amount from $2 million to $6 million. If the point of order, which the Presiding Officer has said he would sustain in this particular case, is sustained against the language in the bill, there would be no money whatsoever for access roads. I do not think the Appropriations Committee wants that to happen. I am sure I do not. I am sure the Members of the Senate who voted for the increase in the amount would not wish to have that happen.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am in the position that all I can do is to appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been no point of order against the pending amendment. The Senator from Delaware made a point of order against the language in the appropriation bill, on page 31, which the Chair sustained as legislation on an appropriation bill. The Senator from Washington now has submitted an amendment which would take out the objectionable language. So far as the Chair is concerned, there is nothing to rule on. The Chair is ready to put the question, if the Senate is ready to vote.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has not the Senate already voted on the question at issue? The amendment now submitted, if the amendment is insisted on—I thought perhaps the two-thirds rule might be invoked, but it was not—would involve a duplication of the vote already taken, would it not, except for the language to which there was objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a decision to be made by the Senate. The amendment is a new amendment. The Senate voted on the $6 million appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it correct to say that the point of order raised by the Senator from Delaware was sustained, which struck out the language on lines 8 through 13 of page 31 of the bill, and that the Senator from Washington has submitted a new amendment, with new language which meets the requirement of the rule? In other words, it is language which is not legislation on an appropriation bill, but merely would fulfill existing law, with the sum of $6 million provided therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has succinctly stated the new amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So we vote again for the $6 million, and we shall be on our way to doing business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment does not embody the language which is legislation on a appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. MAGNUSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senate is to sustain the vote previously taken, the vote again would be "yea," would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think it should be clear that the Senator from Washington is not striking from the bill certain language which is legislation. That language has been stricken from the bill by a point of order. It is not in the bill any longer.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. I have submitted a new amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Washington submitted a new amendment which, if agreed to, would do the same thing as the Senator previously tried to do. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is my understanding, Mr. President, that the amendment of the Senator from Washington is merely an amendment similar to the amendment which was voted on a few minutes ago. Therefore, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order. My point of order is not made on the basis that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, but on the basis that the preceding question has been determined by a vote. Therefore it is not in order to vote again on the same question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that there has been a substantial change in the amendment, and that the amendment embodies no legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Chair has now ruled on the question. I do not think any Senator is confused. I do not believe any votes will be changed on the substantive question as to whether or not $6 million is to be included for access roads. In an attempt to save time, and I think to express the will of all Senators as it was expressed before, I ask unanimous consent that the yea and nay vote on the preceding amendment be made the yea and nay vote upon the pending amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think we should make clear that what this amendment does is provide a 300-percent increase in the item over and above what the Budget Bureau recommended. That increase would be added to an item which was rejected by the House of Representatives in its entirety. There has been no justification by the Budget Bureau or in any other way.

In addition, this appropriation bill already includes $120 million over and above what was provided in last year's bill. Last year's bill was increased by about $70 million over the preceding year. During the past 12 months, as a result of increased appropriations, the Department of the Interior has added 5,694 new employees. It added 1,500 new employees during April, the most recent month on which the joint committee has reported.

Since the beginning of the Kennedy administration, in January 1961, the Department of the Interior has added an average of 18 new employees every day. The calculation includes holidays and is based on a Government 5-day work week.

With much of the money appropriated there is being built up a big political bureaucracy. Let us not delude ourselves. If that is what the Senate wants,

let us approve the increased appropriation; but before we do so, let us recognize that a vote for these increases would be a vote against the possibility of a tax reduction. We are hearing a great deal of talk from high administration officials about reducing taxes. I have said it is nothing but political propaganda in an election year. We will not cut taxes as long as we increase expenditures. I think every Senator knows that.

If we want to cut taxes, the way to do so is to cut down the spending and then pass the savings on to the people in a bona fide tax reduction. I think the people of our country have as much sense about spending their money as any bureaucrat in Washington, under the present administration or under any other administration. Why siphon all of their money through Washington?

If Senators vote for the amendment making these increases they will vote for it with a clear understanding that not only are they approving a bill which carries a substantial increase—a $120 million increase—over the appropriation in the preceding year for the same department, but also they are voting another 4 million over what even the Budget Bureau has asked. And no one has accused the Budget Bureau of being bashful in asking for money.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall take but a moment. The money proposed to be expended would be returned. A revolving fund to build roads to obtain access to forest lands that are eligible to be cut would be established. The amendment has nothing to do with taxes. We would receive the money back. We would create more wealth by using lands which are not now being cut.

There is involved the same old question we have heard discussed year after year. The amendment would make it possible for some of the smaller operators to bid on certain forest lands on which cutting is allowable. It would help to revive an industry that is in trouble. It would add more taxes to the national economy. It would open up new areas for recreation and other purposes.

I know who is opposed to the amendment. Those who are opposed have great forest reserves and do not want other reserves opened up. That is all the opposition amounts to. It is an old story.

Within 17 months, by a conservative estimate, the amount of money expended would be paid back into the Treasury. Taxes would be much greater when lands on which there is allowable cutting are set aside for cutting on a sustained-yield basis under the conservation program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I did not make a point of order in the beginning because I was willing to go along with the recommendation of the Budget Bureau for an appropriation of $2 million for these access roads. I will go along with the restoration of the $2 million as recommended by the committee if the Magnuson amendment can be defeated.

I am not seeking to eliminate the item in its entirety, but I do object to increasing it 300 percent over and above what the Budget Bureau said was needed. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. On that question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "nay," and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 40, as follows:

[No. 87 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Allott	Hart	Moss
Anderson	Hartke	Neuberger
Bartlett	Hayden	Pastore
Bible	Hill	Pell
Burdick	Humphrey	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Robertson
Cannon	Kefauver	Scott
Carroll	Kuchel	Smith, Mass.
Case, S. Dak.	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Church	Long, Hawaii	Stennis
Clark	Magnuson	Symington
Dodd	Mansfield	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McGee	Yarborough
Engle	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Monroney	
Gruening	Morse	

NAYS—40

Beall	Ervin	Murphy
Bennett	Fong	Pearson
Boggs	Goldwater	Prouty
Bush	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Butler	Hruska	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jordan	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Keating	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Kerr	Talmadge
Cotton	Lausche	Thurmond
Curtis	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Douglas	Miller	
Ellender	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—11

Aiken	Hickey	Morton
Carlson	Holland	Muskie
Chavez	Johnston	Tower
Fulbright	McNamara	

So Mr. MAGNUSON's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "5-17-62—C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I can make an explanation of the amendment which will be satisfactory, I am sure, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be not read, but, instead, that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 9, lines 1 to 3, strike out ", other than judgment funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission or the Court of Claims,".

On page 9, line 6, change the colon to a comma and add "except that judgment funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission or the Court of Claims and the interest thereon may not be advanced to the tribes until a report of the purposes for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and both committees have approved the advance by committee resolution or neither committee has disapproved the advance by committee resolution within sixty calendar days from the date the report is submitted to the committees, not counting days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain:".

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the amendment that I am proposing is intended to accomplish the same purpose as the language reported by the Appropriations Committee, but to allow a little more flexibility in the programing and use of Indian judgment funds.

The committee language would preclude any use of the judgment funds, although previously appropriated by Congress, until substantive legislation has been enacted specifying the purposes for which the money may be used. I think this is a little too rigid and that our purpose could be accomplished in a slightly different manner.

The amendment I am proposing would require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a plan prepared by him and the Indian tribe for the use of the judgment money already appropriated by Congress. The plan would have to lie before the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the two Houses for 60 days unless both committees adopt resolutions approving the plan at an earlier time. If neither committee has disapproved the plan by the end of the 60 days, the money would become available to carry out the plan.

This is the procedure Congress has provided in other cases, and I believe it is a good procedure to use here. It has been written into the law with respect to the disposal of utility systems on In-

dian reservations, and also with respect to small reclamation projects.

The amendment is not intended to preclude the Secretary of Interior from paying the costs of litigation in accordance with the terms of approved contracts.

I should also say that I appreciated very much what the Committee on Appropriations has done. It put into the bill the language which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs sent to the Committee on Appropriations and asked to have included in the bill. However, after it was included it was called to our attention that this would preclude the use of the judgment funds until authorizing legislation had been enacted. I believe the amendment I am offering will allow flexibility in using judgment funds, which are running into many millions of dollars, and retain in Congress an opportunity to look at them before they are programed. I would appreciate it very much if the chairman of the committee would accept the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I agree with the amendment. I believe it is justified, and is a legitimate precaution to take. I will be glad to accept it and take it to conference. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "$55,550,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$57,000,000."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the amendment seeks to add some money to permit the Navajo Indian irrigation project to be started.

Under the Navajo Indian irrigation project, 110,630 acres of Navajo Reservation lands will be developed and irrigated, providing farms for 1,120 Navajo families and giving a livelihood in related service activities to another 2,240 families, thus providing a higher standard of living for more than 16,000 Navajo Indians.

It is necessary that funds be made available in fiscal year 1963 because the Navajo Reservoir is presently being filled with water. Consequently it is most important that the control works and tunnel be started as soon as possible to avoid increases in the costs which would develop if this work were accomplished after the reservoir was filled. Also, it is planned to dump a part of the waste from the tunnel excavation in the reservoir area and the rest of it in the Kutz Canyon. This plan provides two working headings for the tunnel which would not be possible if the reservoir were filled with water.

It is also necessary that the definite plan report be formulated as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the work proposed for fiscal year 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Navajo irrigation project, work proposed for fiscal year 1963

Development of definite plan and report:	
Aerial surveys and topographical map project area	$415,600
Aerial surveys main canal and structures	104,800
Soil surveys	156,000
Agricultural economic studies	31,200
Engineering studies and report	111,200
Total	818,800
Preconstruction surveys, investigations and designs:	
Geologic	100,000
Design preparation of plans of outlet works and tunnel	100,000
Total	200,000
Construction of reservoir outlet works and tunnel (2 miles)	400,000
Purchase of right-of-way	31,200
Total estimate	1,450,000

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the able Senator from Arizona knows as much about this project as anyone else, if not more. I should merely like to have his comment on the amendment, because the authorization bill has yet to be signed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in my judgment the Senate cannot consider this amendment until we have received an estimate, to be submitted by the Bureau of the Budget in the supplemental appropriation bill. Neither has the authorization bill be signed by the President.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it has not been signed. The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is a member of the Senator's subcommittee, had intended to present the amendment. I am merely presenting it for him in his absence. At the time the amendment was proposed, it was hoped that the authorization bill would have been signed, and that the amendment might properly be acted on at this time.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand, the authorization bill has not yet been signed. I think the proposal would be strengthened if we had a budget estimate. I suggest that the Senator from New Mexico withdraw the amendment now and resubmit it at a later time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in view of that advice, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the estimated total cost of the project?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it is $135 million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The appropriation bill provides $55 million.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, no. An attempt was made in the beginning to provide $555,000. The Bureau of Reclamation felt that if the tunnel could be cut before the reservoir filled, a substantial sum of money would be saved. However, I have taken the advice of the chairman of the committee and have withdrawn the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Was not this proposal discussed in the Senate a year ago?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I understand, the issue at that time was the development of new farmlands through the expenditure of public moneys, while the Government was paying money to farmers to take lands out of production. Was not that the argument?

Mr. ANDERSON. That was the argument. If the Senator from Ohio knew what the House had done, he would feel very happy over its action. The House took what I believe is completely unprecedented action. The House provided that no crop which is now certified by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus production may be raised on any of this land until 10 years after the completion of the project. Since the project probably will not be finished for at least 10 to 14 years, that will put off any possibility of using the land for almost a quarter of a century.

Mr. President, I gladly accept the advice of the senior Senator from Arizona, who has been a Member of the Senate for quite some time and has been handling appropriations for a long period of time. I will abide by his suggestion. However, I felt, in justice to my colleague from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], that I should offer the amendment. However, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6–11–62—A" and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 8, before the period it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to remove any machinery, equipment, or facilities from the oil shale pilot plant at Rifle, Colorado".

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, in 1944 the U.S. Government constructed a pilot oil shale plant at Rifle, Colo., at a cost of about $20 million. Since 1956 no research has been conducted at that plant and the facility has been kept in a standby condition. At the Rifle plant are expensive retorts used in breaking down the shale into oil. The retorts are the essential equipment in the whole experimental process. We want to be sure that the equipment at Rifle stays at Rifle.

There is a real possibility that the Rifle plant will soon be reopened. The Navy Department and Interior Department are seeking to negotiate with educational institutions to supervise experimental work on oil shale without further cost to the Government.

The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, was successful in having included in the bill before the Senate today an amount of $187,000 to expand oil shale research to be conducted, I understand, in Laramie, Wyo.

Rumors have been circulating that as a part of the research to be conducted in Laramie, Wyo., one of the principal retorts at the Rifle, Colo., plant is to be removed. I understand from the Senator from Wyoming that it is not his intention that that be the effect of his amendment; that it is not contemplated by the Bureau of Mines that any machinery or retorts at Rifle, Colo., be removed.

The Senator from Wyoming is in the Chamber; and if he wishes to speak on this subject, I shall be pleased to yield to him.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado for raising this question. I assure him that never was it the intention, in seeking the additional appropriation for an oil shale laboratory on the campus of the University of Wyoming, to remove any of the facilities from Rifle, Colo.

Actually, the real purpose of the appropriation which I support is to speed up experimentation and exploration, in the hope that a breakthrough may be made in some of the related byproducts of the oil shale land. For example, it is thought that in the oxygen compounds, or nitrogen, or sulfur compounds some products which are noncompetitive with oil may be found. That is why our scholars and research scientists have asked for the extra money. There is no intention or desire to pirate any of the plant from Rifle, Colo.

In all truth, I hope we may intensify the activity on the campus of my university and, at the same time, get the plant at Rifle in operation again, because I think it is most urgent that we develop all of the possibilities available to us in the national interest; that we not neglect any of these potential breakthroughs.

It is for that reason that I support the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I observe in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who, together with former Senator O'Mahoney of Wyoming many years ago, was known as the father of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act. The senior Senator from West Virginia knows the history and the background of this research. He pioneered in this vital program. If he desires me to yield, I shall do so for any comment he may desire to make.

COAL AND OIL SHALE RESEARCH TO DEVELOP SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I thank the astute Senator from Colorado. Only that the record, of an earlier effort, may supplement the cogent remarks of the Senator from Colorado and the pertinent observations of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], I would note that the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, which became law in 1944, brought into being not only research in the processing of high-octane gasoline from coal, but also investigations in the important area of the processing of oil and oil products from shale.

It was, as my friend from Colorado noted, my privilege and responsibility, when a Member of the House of Representatives, to have sponsored the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act with former Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming. After having been passed earlier in the Senate under the persuasive and effective management of our esteemed former colleague from Wyoming, the measure was passed by the House on February 16, 1944, under the stress of wartime demands for liquid fuels. It was extended later, when peacetime demands for oil and oil products surpassed peak requirements of World War II.

Thus, the provisions of the act were first implemented during the last administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, was continued during the administrations of President Harry S. Truman, but was permitted to expire during the administrations of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

I hope that research intended to develop liquid fuels from coal will be renewed. And I trust there will be further investigations of the feasibility of producing oil from shale.

Our colleagues from Colorado and Wyoming and those from other Rocky Mountain States appropriately call attention to the large quantities of oil shale which exist there.

In the earlier research activities under authority of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of 1944, the U.S. Bureau of Mines built and operated three laboratories and two engineering plants. One laboratory was at Laramie, Wyo. It was dedicated to the study of oil shale and related problems. Another laboratory was at Bruceton, Pa., where there was study of the broad problem of coal-to-oil processing. And a later laboratory at Morgantown, W. Va., was established primarily to perform missions in the conversion of coal to gas, both for direct use as fuel and for synthesis of liquid fuels and chemicals.

A station at Louisiana, Mo., was used to demonstrate on a semicommercial scale the conversion of synthesis gas—made from coal—to liquid products.

And there was the experiment station at Rifle, Colorado, which the diligent Senators from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and [Mr. ALLOTT] seek to protect—and very properly so—by this amendment. The station at Rifle was built to demonstrate methods for mining and retorting oil shale and for converting crude shale oil to other fuels by refining. Earlier this year I had the opportunity and the privilege of renewing acquaintances in that section of Colorado. It was a pleasure to inspect the properties there which formerly played a substantial role in the synthetic liquid fuels research. I share the hope and the optimism of both Senators from Colorado that the facilities at Rifle will soon again be active centers for important research.

Today, my colleagues, in this measure before the Senate, we are dealing again with funds for the programing of a continuation of research and pilot projects in a field in which there is a rich history. We are thinking it terms of broadening the scope of investigations begun at Rifle, Colo., at Bruceton, Pa., at Morgantown, W. Va., at Laramie, Wyo., and at Louisiana, Mo. In the earlier explorations there were experimentations with certain agricultural products which were thought to lend themselves to conversion into liquid fuels, and it may be that in the future these investigations might also be renewed.

I shall use 2 or 3 additional minutes to review the fact that Congress acted affirmatively in this matter in 1944. We were, Mr. President, under the impact of the stringencies of international conflict. We were faced with the condition under which the oil supplies from overseas so necessary to supplement our domestic production were cut off not only in degree, but faced a possible total blockade.

Meanwhile, Mr. President, we knew that the Royal Air Force of the British Empire and the Luftwaffe of Nazi Germany were powered substantially by synthetic liquid fuels processed from coal. Yet we were tardy in recognizing that in our own coal and shale deposits we had similar—in fact, greater, possibilities. That was the real reason why our esteemed former colleague, Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, and I sponsored the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act and why it was passed overwhelmingly in both Houses of the Congress.

So, Mr. President, I support with enthusiasm the committee's coal research amendments and I likewise support the clarifying amendment the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has offered, and I congratulate the Senators from Colorado and the Senators from Wyoming, in whose States oil shale is to be found in abundance.

The breakthrough can come and should come, not because we are under the crises of the so-called cold war or because of possible conflict in the future, but because it is incumbent on us to move forward in the areas of research which show real promise. We must work for the feasibility of production of gasoline processed by synthetic means from coal and oil shale. This should be a part of our national growth and our resources for the future.

I am grateful to the Senator from Colorado for his generous remarks. He has afforded me the opportunity to not only speak on this point, but also to express the view that funds provided and spent for research and development in this area will bring back not only the original investment but, also, a dividend to the economy and the security of the United States. Again, I congratulate the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] for their timely and knowledgable remarks.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I thank the able senior Senator from West Virginia. I know of his great interest in this program and I know of his contributions in years past. His remarks today are very timely and pertinent.

Mr. President, this matter was discussed on the floor of the House of Representatives. Mr. ASPINALL, the chairman of the Interior Committee, objected to the addition of the $187,000 for oil shale research unless there was a clarifi-

cation of its purpose. I think this amendment satisfies everyone.

I now ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], if he will accept the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is no controversy about this matter. The Senator has stated the situation as it is, and it should not be disturbed. So I think there is no controversy about the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I intend to support the amendment. I have long fought for the development of our oil-shale resources.

Oil shale is a natural resource with which we in this country are singularly endowed. In fact, it is a latent resource which, most assuredly, will one day find its rightful place in the roster of basic minerals. On numerous occasions, I have directed attention to the fact that in the Colorado-Wyoming-Utah area the Green River deposits of oil shale exceed 1½ trillion barrels of recoverable oil. This is an exceedingly significant reserve which becomes even more meaningful when compared with the fact that the known liquid petroleum reserves of the United States are 35 billion barrels. Oil products are essential to peacetime development. They are critical in time of war. To do other than prepare ourselves to draw upon this vital reserve, safe within our own borders, is sheer folly. I made that statement here on the floor of the Senate over a year ago; I repeat it now.

The technology advances, the techniques of oil shale extraction and other data now available are in no small way directly attributable to research work carried on at the demonstration plant on the naval oil shale reserves near Rifle, Colo. Before these mountains of shale can be reduced to petroleum, research must continue, culminating, ultimately, in a commercial production capable of fulfilling peacetime industrial uses and defense requirements. In order to move forward with research projects in these fields, the Bureau of Mines budget for fiscal year 1963 included the sum of $187,000.

I have followed with particular interest this request of the Bureau of Mines, especially since this modest amount was defeated by the other body. In a letter dated April 12, 1962, to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I requested restoration of this budget item, in spite of the fact the Bureau of Mines had not requested such restoration. In response to this request and, I understand, with the support of the senior Senator from Wyoming, the subcommittee on May 1, 1962, restored the $187,000, and we in the full committee confirmed this action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, the letter written by me on April 12, 1962, to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee requesting the restoration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 12, 1962

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am extremely concerned over the $187,000 deleted by the House of Representatives from the fiscal year 1963 Bureau of Mines budget, which money is programed for expanded oil shale research. I believe that these funds are urgently needed to provide information that is technologically and economically critical to the development of the oil shale industry, either in a normal, commercial sense or under the stress of a national emergency.

Because of this conviction, I wrote the Department of the Interior inquiring as to the proposed use and the need for this $187,000. I enclose a copy of the letter and memorandum on this subject which was received from the Department in reply.

I would appreciate your making this information available to members of the subcommittee for their most earnest consideration for restoration of this item. You can be assured of my support for this restoration when the full committee takes up the bill.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON ALLOTT.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the other body's action was due, in part, to the fact that some uncertainty exists over which Department of Government should take control of the plant—Interior or Defense. While it would be most helpful to have a clear demarcation of authority, nevertheless, while the respective Departments lock horns, the plant facilities deteriorate. It is far better, and a more judicious use of the plant, to allow the Bureau of Mines to engage in research during the interim. I certainly favor an expeditious solution to the question of jurisdiction, and to that end have introduced, along with the senior Senator from Utah, S. 1277, which would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to take exclusive possession and control of the Rifle plant.

There was also some concern that this $187,000 appropriation would result in the transfer from Rifle to Laramie, Wyo., of the retort, which forms an integral part of the plant's operation. This is a very real concern and certainly a matter to be dealt with. However, I have assurances from the Bureau of Mines that the removal of any equipment from Rifle is very remote. The Acting Director of the Bureau, in a letter to me dated April 9, gave me that assurance. At the appropriate place in my remarks, I shall place the full text of that letter in the RECORD.

I may say that was 3 days before I wrote to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the letter requesting the restoration of this amount.

Therefore, we have the situation where one of the sources of concern is, as a practical matter, removed, and the other a dispute between Interior and Defense, is far from settled. But I reiterate that in my judgment the facilities at Rifle can better survive the deadlock by being put to use and maintained, rather than by slowly rotting away.

The Bureau of Mines, at my request, furnished me with its proposed program for the use to be made of the $187,000. Included is development work in the retorting step, the least advanced of all oil shale technique. In addition, the Bureau plans to investigate the potential of oil shale and its products as a source of chemicals. Finally, there is the expressed intention to assess oil potential of the Piceance Creek Basin, a possible prospective extension of the present known shale deposits. In order to have, in detail, the program as outlined by the Bureau of Mines, in justification of this budget request, I ask unanimous consent that the plans be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the plans were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL-SHALE PROGRAM—PLANS FOR USE OF $187,000 DELETED BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM 1963 BUDGET REQUEST

It is the firm opinion of the Bureau of Mines that the work that is programed under this $187,000 is urgently needed to provide practical information that is technologically and economically critical to development of an oil-shale industry, either in a normal commercial sense or under the stress of a national emergency.

Of all the Bureau and other process development work in the field of oil shale, the retorting step, in which oil is produced from the shale rock, is the least advanced. A particularly important consideration in the retorting operation, and one on which the Bureau proposes intensive effort, is the means of efficient removal of oil from the retorting system as the oil is produced from the shale and comprehensive recovery of the oil after its removal. Contrary to popular belief, shale oil evolves as a mist in the retort rather than as a true vapor or gas. The size of individual particles in this mist is a most important factor in final yield of oil and in trouble-free operation of a retort. If the mist particles are too large, they tend to mass together and form larger particles in the retort with subsequent troublesome coking and burning along with decrease in yield of oil. Conversely, if the particles are too small, their recovery in oil-collection equipment is difficult and again unnecessary losses occur. These problems are well recognized, but their solutions are not. Therefore, the Bureau recommends strongly that funds be provided to permit pilot-scale and supporting laboratory development work on the formation and control of oil-shale mists in retorting and recovery systems. Effective progress toward solution of the problems described depends upon such joint efforts which are not feasible without additional support.

Another important study planned under and dependent upon the $187,000 increase is to investigate the potential of oil shale and its products as a source of chemicals. By terms of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of 1944 and subsequent amendments thereto, the Bureau's research and development work on oil shale was directed toward the production of fuel products, and this guideline was continued to the present day even though the act mentioned has not been in effect in recent years. However, somewhat parallel to the situation that has developed in the petroleum industry, the economics of an oil-shale industry will depend, perhaps to an important degree, upon the chemicals and other byproducts that can be produced from shale along with more conventional fuel products. The possibilities of such supplementary support are largely unknown; however, based upon the fragmentary information that now is available, the potential of

an oil-shale chemical industry (a "karochemical industry," is an appropriate and perhaps more descriptive term) is large. The Bureau of Mines feels that it can add considerable impetus to development of an oil-shale industry through providing technical and economic information to evaluate the "karochemical" potential, but is unable to do so without additional financial support of its program.

Other work planned under the $187,000 increase includes assessment of the oil potential of what are thought to be vast oil-shale deposits that have been only recently discovered in the Piceance Creek basin lying north of what was earlier considered to be the principal oil-shale area of Colorado. Only cursory information now is available about the extent of the Piceance Creek deposits, and about such important evaluation factors as their richness and pattern of oil yield as related to depth and geographical location. Additional work is proposed by the Bureau to fill the gaps in the Piceance Creek picture in order to stimulate eventual development of this extension of the Nation's oil-shale reserves.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, along with this program proposal, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to me from Mr. James Westfield, Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines, appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D.C., April 9, 1962.

Hon. GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: This is in reply to your letter of April 2, 1962, concerning plans of the Bureau of Mines for work on oil shale under the $187,000 that recently was deleted by the House of Representatives from the 1963 budget request.

The work for which the amount mentioned was requested may be categorized under three headings: (1) Laboratory and pilot plant applied research to solve serious problems involved in removing shale oil without undue degradation and loss from the retorting equipment and in the subsequent oil-recovery steps, (2) studies to determine the chemical potential of an oil-shale industry including development of partinent economic information, and (3) investigation of the richness and extent of the large, but as yet poorly defined, oil-shale deposits of the Piceance Creek area of western Colorado lying north of the area that until recently was thought to comprise the bulk of Colorado's oil-shale deposits.

Additional details of the work that is planned and information about the need for each part are included in an enclosure to this letter.

In answer to your question about where the proposed work would be conducted, the laboratory phase of the oil recovery studies would be done at Laramie. Depending on the early results of the laboratory work, the pilot-plant phase might be done wholly or in part at Rifle as appeared most feasible. The possibility of moving any of the Rifle equipment to Laramie is very remote as such a course of action would cause a problem of wide separation of the pilot operations from the supply of shale and probably would be prohibitively expensive in view of the rather limited funds that have been requested. The chemical studies are planned entirely for Laramie, where key members of the staff that would do this work now are located. The Piceance Creek oil-shale evaluation work also would be done by Laramie personnel, but would involve considerable onsite work in Colorado.

The Bureau of Mines appreciates this opportunity to be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

———— ————,
Director.

Mr. ALLOTT. While I believe that a reading of the correspondence I have had with the Bureau of Mines would certainly allay any fears of a reasonable man concerning the possible removal of any machinery or facilities from the installation at Rifle, Colo., the amendment will specifically prohibit such action, and as such I intend to support it.

This sum, $187,000, is indeed modest in terms of the Interior Department Budget as a whole. However, I am confident that it will be wisely used and will result in further advances in oil shale extraction techniques. I hope that the Senate will act favorably on the Bureau's request and, thereafter, stand firm on this item in the event of a conference with the other body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] I call up my amendment, which is at the desk and identified as "6–6–62—A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware for himself and the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 20, beginning with line 19, to strike all down to and including line 23.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I cannot conceive of this amendment's being objected to. The amendment carries out the objectives of the President, who earlier this year made a rather strong speech against the excessive cost of the stockpiling program in general. The President and later the Senator from Missouri criticized the manner in which we have accumulated excessive inventories of minerals in our strategic stockpiles. The President said that it was bordering on a national scandal and that we should stop accumulating these minerals.

This amendment proposes to strike from the bill the money provided to subsidize the increased production of lead and zinc. This subsidy program was established by the Congress last year as a part of the stockpiling program of this country. In the preceding year President Eisenhower had vetoed a similar bill. Why should we provide an incentive for the production of lead and zinc at a time when both are in oversupply and overproduction? This program was authorized under a bill which was passed by the Congress at the last session in 1961 and signed by President Kennedy.

Later President Kennedy saw the evils of this program and became concerned about its excessive cost and suggested that the program be curtailed and investigated.

In 1960 a similar bill was passed by the Congress and vetoed by then President Eisenhower as being unjustifiable. I am sorry that last year the Congress passed the bill and that President Kennedy signed it; however, there is time now for us to rectify this mistake.

I congratulate the President of the United States on later recognizing the fact that with $8½ billion worth of these minerals in our stockpile there is no further need either to provide an incentive for their increased production or for stockpiling them.

As an example, we have in the national stockpile today $384,832,300 worth of lead. We have a potential loss on it, based on today's market, of $117,898,100. Why should we pass a bill here today which will provide a further incentive for the production of more lead?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have a memorandum obtained from the authorities in charge of the stockpile showing that we now have on hand 1,302,000 tons of lead, and that our objective for strategic purposes required a volume of 286,000 tons. In other words, we have 1,302,000 tons, when the estimate for security purposes is that we need 286,000 tons. Therefore, the volume on hand is four times the needed amount of lead for strategic purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. The General Services Administration recently supplied information to the effect that the amount of lead which we have on hand over and above what can be justified in the name of national defense is 986,355 tons at a cost of $291,037,300. Certainly we should be talking about liquidating that inventory, as the President pointed out, rather than increasing the production of lead or adding to the stockpile.

The bill provides for a subsidy of $75 per ton up to 1,500 tons of lead per year for each mine. The so-called small lead producers can sell their lead in the open market. The market price at present is 9 or 9½ cents, but the Government will pay 75 percent of the difference between the market price and 14½ cents. A producer will be subsidized on that amount up to 1,500 tons. At present market prices that represents a subsidy of about $75 a ton for the production of lead.

Why should be subsidize further the production of lead when we have more lead than we can use in the stockpile?

In bills before the Congress the President is asking for approval of the Congress to dispose of certain items in this stockpile. If we want to get rid of them—and I agree with the President that we should cut down on this excessive inventory—the first step is to stop buying. It makes no sense to say we want to cut down on the stockpile when at the same time we are buying those identical minerals.

No one attempts to justify this subsidy of lead and zinc in the name of national defense.

Let us be realistic—this program is no direct contradiction to the President's request for a cutback on stockpiling costs.

If the Congress wants to pass this bill then let us stop criticizing the stockpiling program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I call attention to the provisions of the bill for which the appropriation is being made in the language now before us. Am I correct that the bill which passed last October provides that the Government shall pay to the producer an amount equal to 75 percent of the difference between 14½ cents a pound, the designated price in the statute, and the price for which lead is selling on the market?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To illustrate, lead today is selling at 9½ cents a pound on the market. The designated price in the statute is that the producer shall receive 14½ cents. The difference, therefore, is 5 cents a pound, of which the Federal Government pays 75 percent for each pound to the producer. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct, up to 1,500 tons per mine.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Seventy-five percent of 5 cents is 3¾ pennies. With 2,000 pounds per ton, 3¾ pennies per pound results in a figure for the Federal Government to pay to the producer of $75 a ton, as of today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The statute says that the Government will subsidize up to 1,500 tons per mine; is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So an operator with a 1,500-ton producing mine would receive $75 times 1,500, or $112,500 for the production of the mine.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. This bill proposes to subsidize the expanded production of lead at a time when we have more lead than we know what to do with, at a time when the President of the United States says that our stockpiling program is already bordering on a national scandal, and at a time when the President is asking the Congress for authority to liquidate inventory of the stockpile rather than to add further to it.

This program is in direct contradiction to what the President said he wanted Congress to do and what the President said he wanted to do in connection with the stockpiling program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield further.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Last year, in the discussion with the Senator from Colorado, it was developed that to produce 2,000 tons of lead in a mine required 40 workers. I assume that to produce 1,500 tons of lead in a mine would require three-quarters of 40 workers, or 30 workers.

I submit, if we should pay $112,500 to a producer of 1,500 tons of lead, and if that producer had 30 workers, since it would cost us $112,500 for the 30 workers the cost would be $3,750 for each worker, in order to run the mine.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is one way of stating it.

As the Senator from Ohio so ably pointed out last year when he led the opposition to these proposals, we might as well recognize the fact that this proposal involves not only a subsidizing of the workers but also a subsidizing of the operation of these mines. This is what has been described as a "75 percent Brannan plan" for the lead and zinc industry of America.

Senators will remember that former Secretary of Agriculture Brannan proposed that the Federal Government adopt an agricultural program under which the farmer could sell his commodities in the open market for any price available and could bill the Government for the differential between the price he received and the support price. The Congress overwhelmingly repudiated that suggestion. This proposal is for 75 percent of that formula for the lead and zinc industries is just as bad.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator express an opinion on this statement: With four times more lead in the stockpile than is needed, if the appropriation is passed Congress will be authorizing the payment to producers of lead mines of approximately $3,750 per person to keep the mines open and to produce lead which we do not need.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right.

There is another provision in the same section of the bill which would subsidize the zinc industry. Zinc is to be subsidized on the basis of 55 percent instead of 75 percent of the differential between the price at which the zinc is sold in the open market and 14½ cents per pound.

We also have an excess inventory of zinc. There is eight times as much zinc in the stockpile as we need. We should be getting rid of zinc rather than adding to our inventory. There is a total of 1,401,616 tons of zinc in our stockpile over and above what there is any possible justification for in the interests of national defense. That excess zinc cost the American taxpayer, when it was purchased, $392,039,400.

Now they want a subsidy to produce more zinc.

The irony of the situation is that some of those supporting this subsidy for increased production of lead and zinc are publicly leading the parade in criticizing our stockpiling program. There is already a potential loss on zinc approximating $100 million.

As the President said, the way these materials have been accumulated is a national scandal, and in my opinion the way the Government insists upon continuing the subsidy program is a national disgrace.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point, in respect to zinc?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have available the latest report on zinc. It has been obtained from the General Services Administration.

The Federal Government has on hand now 1,580,000 tons of zinc. Our stockpile objective was 178,000 tons. In other words, the oversupply is in the ratio of more than 8 to 1.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We have on hand more than 8 times as much zinc as we need for strategic purposes, yet we contemplate, by the appropriation bill, paying to zinc producers 55 percent of the difference between the designated price of 14½ cents per pound and the price paid on the market, which on June 8 was 11½ cents a pound. That is 3 cents a pound, on which the differential of 55 percent would be paid. Does the Senator agree wtih me up to that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That would mean we would agree to pay 1.65 cents per pound as of present-day prices, or $33 per ton. For 1,500 tons that would result in a figure for zinc operators of $49,500 per mine.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. Under the pending bill we are to pay that much to encourage the production of zinc, a commodity of which, as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, we have more than 8 times as much as we can possibly justify in the name of national defense. It is a commodity which the President of the United States said we should be liquidating. Many Members of Congress supported the President in the statement that we should be liquidating these excessive inventories in the stockpiling program.

How the President could sign a bill with this provision in it and how any Member of the Senate could vote for it and still express concern over the excessive cost of our stockpile is a point which I cannot understand.

Why have an investigation into our stockpiling program if we are going to vote for a continuation of the subsidy for our pet minerals?

I agree fully that we have a problem with respect to the disposition of these excess inventories, but the No. 1 step in getting out of our excessive stockpile is to stop subsidizing increased production.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield further.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The stockpile we have been talking about is the one which has been under discussion in the newspapers in the past 2 months?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Which has been characterized as being loaded with scandal?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, it is the same stockpile program which the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] is presently engaged in investigation. It is the same stockpile with respect to which there has been a great deal of discussion about excess inventories.

The Senator from Missouri recently made recommendations as to how the Government should start liquidating certain of these minerals, but certainly the No. 1 step in liquidating a stockpile

is to stop adding to it; otherwise we are just throwing away more money.

One of the arguments which has been made is that by rejecting this subsidy here today we would be reneging on a contract which Congress approved last year. Some of the supporters of the subsidy argue, "Congress passed the bill; therefore these commitments are made and we have a contractual obligation to pay the subsidy now. That is wrong. We have no commitments under this law. I checked with the Secretary of the Interior. I asked him the question of whether under the law passed by the Congress last year and signed by President Kennedy anything had been done. I asked the Secretary how much had been spent and how much had been committed as of the date of my letter.

I received a reply from the Assistant Secretary, which I shall later place in the RECORD, in which he stated that there had been no payments made under the 1961 act and that there had been no commitments or obligations made for payments under that act. He went further and said that no obligations would be incurred until funds were provided in the appropriation bill and were available.

In other words, he has made no commitments. He has made no obligations. If we do not provide the money, there will be no commitment and no obligation. Our amendment to repeal this subsidy is perfectly in order.

I shall ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. May 8, 1962.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is about a month ago?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Assistant Secretary of Interior stated that no expenditures had been made and no commitments undertaken under the bill passed last October?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. I shall read the entire letter.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think it ought to be read.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. My letter to Hon. Stewart L. Udall is dated April 24, 1962, and is as follows:

APRIL 24, 1962.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Last year Congress passed H.R. 84 (Public Law 87-347), the purpose of which was to authorize a direct subsidy to be paid to the producers of lead and zinc.

In this connection will you please advise me the total amount of all such subsidies which have been paid or which the Government is obligated to pay under this law.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

On May 8 I received the following reply:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1962.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: As of this date no stabilization payments have been made to domestic producers of lead and zinc under Public Law 87-347 about which you inquired in your letter of April 24. This law authorizes a maximum of $16,500,000 over a 4-year period, of which $4,500,000 is allowed in calendar year 1962. This amount was requested by the Department of the Interior in the supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1962 (H.R. 11038). No obligations will be incurred until funds provided in this bill are available.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. KELLY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As of May 8 there was a direct communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior to the effect that no expenditures had been made and no obligations undertaken, and none would be undertaken until the money was made available.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is what the Assistant Secretary of the Interior stated in the letter. So at this time we can act on the amendment without in any way jeopardizing any obligations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question of clarification?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think what the Senator has said is correct with respect to the particular item. But I am sure he is aware that in the second supplemental appropriation bill, which was passed, the Senate included an item of $4,880,000 for the purpose stated. The bill is still in conference between the House and the Senate. The appropriation was for the calendar year 1962.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am aware of that fact. At the time the bill was considered the item slipped by, or I would have opposed it also.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am sure that the Senator would have done so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But that does not alter the fact that in reply to my letter the Assistant Secretary said that no commitments had been made nor would any obligations be incurred until he received the funds. The Senator from Colorado will agree with me that as of this time the Secretary has no money for that purpose. The other bill has not as yet been finally approved by the Congress either.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is the reason I asked the Senator to yield. The letter was written in the manner in which it was written because the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1962 to implement the act for the entire calendar year of 1962, which included funds for that purpose, has not yet come out of conference between the Senate and the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Secretary has no money, and no commitments have been made.

We are confronted here today with another appropriation of $2 million and some odd thousand for additional subsidies to the lead and zinc industry, which appropriation we can very properly strike out. In striking it out we would not renege on any obligations because the Secretary has made plain that obligations to spend the money would not be made until after he received the money.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does the item relating to lead and zinc come within the general scope of the newspaper accounts of scandals respecting the stockpile?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; the item is involved in the following way. The lead and zinc that are being subsidized under this bill are not being sought by the Government and placed in the stockpile, but——

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. So on that basis some try to argue that there is no connection. But there is a connection. This subsidy program is definitely designed to increase production of these two minerals. The bill was placed before the Senate and advanced as a defense production measure. It was supported on the basis that in order to protect the security of our country we should subsidize the operations of the multitude of small lead and zinc producers to keep them producing additional lead and zinc. No one has attempted to deny that point. Why subsidize the increased production of lead when we already have four times as much as we need?

Why subsidize the increased production of zinc when we already have eight times as much as we need?

Why criticize the excessive cost of our stockpiling program and then vote for a continuation of the subsidy.

Why go through the grandstand act of investigating the procurement policies under this stockpiling program if we are not going to correct it when we have a chance?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment.

To the extent we pay a subsidy to expand production, such expanded production would be in direct competition with our stockpile inventory. If we want to reduce the stockpile, the first step should be to stop buying. Certainly these programs cannot be separated. The President has said, and the Senator from Missouri has pointed out, that we should be working in the direction of reducing our overall stockpile, but we shall never get the stockpile reduced by adding to it. Certainly as we try to sell some of the stockpile in the open market and then at the same time subsidize the expanded production of the same commodities, we shall be working toward directly opposite objectives. That is the point I am now making. If we wish to reduce the stockpile, and I am reasonably certain that the Senator from Missouri will concur on that point, we should first stop buying. We should stop subsidizing the increased production of any commodities with respect to which there is no need.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it a fact that the President has suggested and recommended that the stockpile be liquidated

or sent into the markets and converted into cash?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. I do not have his speech before me, but if I recall correctly the President said that if we reduced our stockpile to what we actually need we would cut it by about $3 to $3½ million.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On the one hand, it is recommended that we reduce the stockpile, and on the other hand, through the measure now before the Senate, we would subsidize the increased production of lead. Is that the situation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. It would be just as unrealistic for the Congress to adopt a program of continuing high level subsidies for increased production of agricultural products while at the same time the Government was trying to liquidate its excessive inventories. It is equally unsound to treat in that way the mining industry or any other segment of our economy.

I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and myself to delete the section authorizing these unwarranted subsidies for lead and zinc will be approved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My calculations show that under the proposed appropriation we would pay more than $3,700 per worker in order to produce lead that we would not need; and we would pay approximately $1,600 per worker in order to produce zinc that we would not need.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. If we wish to subsidize the workers of America, let us do so through unemployment insurance and not through the farce of producing lead and zinc, for which we have no justification.

Mr. President, at the appropriate time, I shall ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. I do not know whether there are sufficient Senators present to obtain the yeas and nays at this time. I will ask for them later.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Oklahoma will make a full presentation on this subject. I thought it might be of interest to Senators if I should make a short statement in respect to information that has come to me in my capacity as chairman of the Minerals Subcommittee. As has been brought out in the colloquy between the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], no money is now being spent for the purpose stated. I have undertaken a study in my own State. Although we will not have a full picture of the benefit this program will bring to the industry until it is in effect and the applications from qualifying miners are in, some information is available. In my State, according to Bureau of Mine data, 77 mines were producing in 1956. By 1961, that figure had dropped to 39. Mr. President, these figures refer to mining operations which could qualify under the terms of this program.

Presumably, in Colorado, the number of applications will lie somewhere between 39 and 77. This is the positive side I regret to advise Senators that since 1956, 63 mines in Colorado have been forced to close. According to information furnished me by the late Dr. Ed Clark, then director of the Colorado Department of Natural Resources and Mr. G. A. Franz, Jr., director of the Colorado Bureau of Mines, 111 mines produced ore in 1956. Only 58 were producing by 1960.

These are small mines. There are those who may feel that it is not important to keep them alive. I say it is important—not only to these unemployed miners, but it is in the national interest to maintain a healthy domestic mining industry. What has depressed the market price on lead and zinc? It is obvious that the price is depressed by the lead and zinc that overhangs the world market. It comes from lead and zinc that comes in from Mexico, Peru, Australia, Canada, and other foreign countries. Imports have caused substantial damage, if it has not already struck the death knell for the metal-mining industry of this Nation, especially with reference to lead and zinc.

If I may digress for a moment I should like to say that last Friday I conducted a hearing to find out what we could do about the gold mining industry. It was in 1934 that Franklin D. Roosevelt fixed the price of gold at $35 an ounce. In all this period of time we know what the increase in the cost of mining operations has been, yet the price of gold has remained fixed. What do Senators think all this has done to the gold mining industry of this Nation? That industry is dying on the vine.

Last Friday we called in the Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs and in a very brilliant presentation he said that because of the "special"—I believe I am using the proper word—because of the unique character of this commodity, gold, we cannot permit a subsidy because of the psychological impact it would have upon the financial markets of the world. There is a link between money and gold, which gives stability to the financial markets of the world, and therefore we could not have a subsidy for gold mining. That industry is dying on the vine. South Africa has a subsidy. Canada has tax incentives. However, in this country we cannot authorize a subsidy because to do so might alarm the people of the world. There may be some merit to that position.

The lead and zinc matter has been repeatedly before the Tariff Commission. We have asked in some instances to have a quota provided, and perhaps provide higher tariffs to help the expiring industry in this country. These measures have all met with stiff opposition. The stabilization approach before us now seemed the only means possible for helping our domestic mining industry.

I wish to be very frank in saying that this $2½ million appropriation is not going to help the little miners of my State very much. The only thing I rise to speak about is that we misconceive the purpose of this type of legislation. It has been before Congress for over 10 years. It was never designed for stockpiling. It was designed to give price stability to an industry which is slowly expiring.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is it not true that there is no money available in this bill for the purchase of either lead or zinc for the stockpile? In fact the bill prohibits any of the lead or zinc produced under the bill to be purchased by the Government.

Mr. CARROLL. That is my understanding.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, the pending bill has nothing to do with the stockpile, with one exception, which the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] brought out, namely that there is already too much lead and zinc. If we move lead and zinc heavily, we will reduce the market price. The pending bill does provide it must be sold in the market; it cannot be stockpiled. The bill makes it possible for small mines and bankrupt people to go back to work in dead or dieing towns in various parts of America. Those miners who participate have to produce less than 3,000 tons a year to get any money under the bill.

Not long ago we took a hundred thousand tons of lead and zinc from two foreign countries. It was a complicated barter.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish the Senator would explain how that barter took place.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate the able Senator's asking me to do that. It would be hard. I have tried to follow it in detail. Four or five countries were involved. The idea was that the world lead market would be reduced because of what some of the countries that sold it would do in the way of barter. There were some cash transactions in it also; therefore it is hard to consider it pure barter, or the kind of barter the Senator from Colorado and I would really understand.

This amendment really involves a subsidy of the production by very small mines, to very small people, in order they may eat, and live, and send their children to school. The lead is to be sold right in the marketplace. No money is provided for stockpiling it.

Therefore I am surprised and distressed at the emphasis some of my colleagues in the Senate are putting on the stockpile aspect.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CARROLL. First, I should like to respond to the able Senator from Missouri. As a matter of fact, as I have stated the lead and zinc question was considered by the Subcommittee on Minerals, of which I am the chairman. That is a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I tried to pursue this matter objectively and impartially, because, as I have indicated, most of the mines in my State are already closed. What I did was to call in State Department witnesses to have them tell us about the overhang of the world market so far as lead was con-

cerned, and tell us what they were doing about that overhang. It is a mistake for Senators to consider that this is a stockpile proposal. The Senator from Missouri has put his finger on the crux of the question. If we want to hold these mines, it means a subsidy. If we want to release the stockpiled materials on the market, it will mean closing the mines.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Both big and little mines.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The large lead producers have been importing and selling, in this country, thousands of tons of lead. That lead is not produced by American miners. It comes from foreign countries, these tremendous amounts of lead and zinc.

Mr. CARROLL. They are doing it today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In addition, there are large corporations which, despite the already heavy costs of the stockpile, have furnished hundreds of millions of dollars of additional materials and minerals for the stockpile, despite the fact we already had enough of some of those materials from the standpoint of what would be needed in case of war.

What we are talking about has nothing to do with stockpiles. What is proposed is simply a method by which people who are now bankrupt and poverty ridden in small towns in many parts of the United States can go back to work in small mines. Not one cent can be obtained under this program unless less than 3,000 tons a year is produced, 1,500 of lead and 1,500 of zinc.

Mr. CARROLL. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I had no idea I would speak at this length, but I wanted to talk about Colorado. The Senator from Oklahoma is really an expert in this field, but I wanted to make a little observation about our mines.

What is proposed is a subsidy, I admit it. I even say that it should have been done years ago.

Mr. President, now I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I concur in the statement made by the Senator from Missouri about the relationship of the amendment to the stockpile. The Senator from Missouri has not made the statement, but the bill contains a provision that the subsidy shall not be given if the Government buys either the lead or the zinc. But there is the relationship that the President of the United States has expressed his horror of a stockpile containing more than $8 billion worth of minerals. He has said the stockpile must be liquidated.

But under this provision of the bill, we propose to begin to produce lead and zinc. True, the quantity will not be large. But I cannot see how, on the one hand, we can complain that we have too much and should liquidate it, while on the other hand, we say that the mines should be opened up, and that every worker on lead will be subsidized in the sum of $3,750, and for every worker on zinc, in the sum of $1,650. I cannot see sound fiscal policy in such a program.

My approach may be antiquated; but if we are to subsidize lead and zinc, what shall we do about machine tools and ceramics and glass? Where shall we stop? More is involved in the small mines, not of 3,000 tons per mine, as the Senator from Missouri has stated, but 1,500 tons per mine. It is the principle that is important, and the question is, Where shall we end?

If the figures as I have recited them are wrong, namely, that we will be subsidizing at the rate of $3,750 per man, if the mine produces 1,500 tons on the basis of today's market, I wish some Senator would point it out.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The total is 3,000 tons—1,500 tons for lead, and 1,500 tons for zinc.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have applied 1,500 tons to lead and 1,500 tons to zinc.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, the figures cited by the Senator from Ohio are a little high, with reference to the subsidy per miner but he is entitled to his opinion. I think he raises a good question. When industries in this Nation are destroyed by the influx of goods and materials, what shall we do about it? That is a good question.

I apologize to the able Senator from Oklahoma for speaking at such length, because I wish to listen to his presentation. I know he will explain the stockpile program and how the procurement will work.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado, who has done so much to help to clarify the situation.

Let me repeat, again and again and again, that the bill has not one thing to do with stockpiling. We are not buying lead and zinc for the stockpile and have not for some time. True, we have brought much lead and zinc into the United States, as we have sold our wheat abroad, at a subsidized price, in a barter exchange for lead and zinc from other countries. It may be true that we could, perhaps, by adopting the amendment, dispose of an infiinitesimal amount of lead and zinc in the stockpile. We could also drive the country into a depression if we suddenly dumped the minerals we have in the stockpile. Of course, we hope to dispose of some of these items in an orderly way; but the result of our barter program with respect to farm surpluses under Public Law 480 has built up a great portion of the surpluses in the stockpile.

This has been a part of the foreign aid program. Perhaps it is a necessary part, but we ought to try to ameliorate the damage which the oversupply of lead and zinc causes on the domestic market today.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] well know that the bill does not authorize the Government to buy a single pound of these materials.

If this program should be killed, we shall be stockpiling human beings who are most anxious to go to work and make an honest dollar. That is the purpose of the appropriation. It is the result of a bill which was carefully discussed, passed by both Houses of Congress, and signed by the President on October 3, 1961. It relates only to small independent producers, because the "big boys" are operating in Peru, in Chile, and in Turkey, and elsewhere throughout the world, in veins which are thick, with machinery that is new, and with labor which is cheap. Foreign imports have knocked the price down to 9½ cents a pound on lead, and to a correspondingly low price on zinc. They do not care whether the mines in the United States operate. Only one-third of the lead and zinc that can be produced in the United States is now being produced. If the production of small mines does not go into the market, it will only increase imports from other countries. Certainly I should like to see them find a market and to help them merchandise their ore here, but not at a time when a combination of low prices and a world surplus has closed every Oklahoma mine in the great tristate area.

Not a miner has been working for several years. The hard-rock miners are awfully hard to convert into airplane mechanics or textile workers. I can tell Senators that. Of course, their sons may move away and do well. Mickey Mantle, the son of a lead and zinc miner, is doing very well; but the miners in the family have been unemployed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The basic reason lead and zinc miners are not working is that large corporations are consistently sending into the United States tens of thousands of tons of lead and zinc now being used in the industrial operation of this country. Is not that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct. Where once we produced 60 percent of our needs in lead and zinc, today we produce only about one-third of our consumption of lead and zinc.

We are trying to keep a few of these mines in the United States alive, even though we have to subsidize them to the extent of a few pennies a pound on a small quantity of lead or zinc, the price of which has been driven down by imported supplies. The Tariff Commission has countless times recommended action to increase tariffs, but no such action has been taken.

Dozens of small mines in my State would benefit from this provision; and it is estimated that about 500 small mines in 20 States would be benefited. The mines to be benefited by this measure must be small mines, because by the terms of this provision they are ineligible if they produced in the base year more than 3,000 tons of lead and zinc, combined, and that means a very small mine operation.

But certainly this provision would raise the hopes of small miners in Colorado and in Missouri, as the Senators from those States well know. Furthermore, unemployment among these miners is today so great that the towns where most of them are living are becoming ghost towns.

When we passed the act, it immediately brought hope that, somehow, we would keep alive production by the small

mines. For calendar year 1962, $4,880,000 has already been approved by both Houses in the supplemental appropriation bill, which now is in conference; and I find it strange that only at this late date is this amendment offered. Of course, none of us can change the item contained in the supplemental bill, because that bill is now in conference.

The funds provided by this item in the pending bill would be for the last half of the fiscal year 1963, to put the program on a fiscal year basis.

It is true, as the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware has said, that no part of these funds has yet been spent; but the miners, now that Congress has three times approved their program to keep alive this small segment of the mining industry, have proceeded on their own—knowing that the bill has been passed by both Houses—to resume work. In one county in Oklahoma more than 300 miners already are at work draining the water, repairing the underground road network, the lifts, and so forth. At least 50 more are at work repairing and reopening the central mill to process and clean the ore. The miners are doing so either without pay or with a promise of deferred pay. But they are at work reconditioning the mines. Without that work, the water would rise and destroy the mines. So the miners are proceeding to get production operations moving. The entire area is taking on hope. The 50 men reopening the central mill—and it is only an example—are making it available again to process and clean the ore. These are small business men. They work with their hands, while wearing aluminum helmets, swinging sharp picks deep underground, digging thin veins of ore, in the hope of reviving the vital tri-State mining area. It seems to me that to eliminate this item now, after they have had their hopes raised, would be tragic, indeed. Now to say to them, "Congress was just kidding you; either Congress did not know what it was doing, or it was just playing fast and loose with your hopes to eliminate unemployment," would be one of the worst things we could possibly do.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I regret that I was not in the Chamber when the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma commenced his remarks. However, apart from what this item means to the individual workers who would be affected by it, will the Senator from Oklahoma state, if he has not already done so, the effection on the national interest if this aid were not forthcoming?

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall be glad to do so. As I have said, traditionally the United States has produced about one-half of its lead and zinc needs. But today that percentage has decreased to about 30 to 40 percent. Once the mines are closed and filled with water, if the water is not soon pumped out again, the ores deep underground, in the hard-rock caverns, disintegrate, the tunnels fall in, and great natural resources are lost.

Furthermore—and this is fundamental and axiomatic in connection with minerals—if a domestic supply is not available, finally we have to pay "through the nose" for foreign supplies because of a lack of available domestic production at a reasonable price. If we become entirely dependent upon overseas supplies, we have no way of keeping the price at a reasonable level.

In this one county, where more than 350 miners have now started work, the projection for the end of the year is 500 miners and 125 working in the Central Mill. Next year the number will be between 800 and 1,000.

Congress has passed many bills for the purpose of giving aid to depressed areas, and has provided for retraining, and for various programs in that connection. However, all that the people in this area are requesting is an opportunity to fight their way back to prosperity. By this means we could obtain only minimum production. But this would enable the miners to resume work, and the wheels would begin to turn again in mining counties. This appropriation would be much cheaper than a retraining program provided as a subsidy by the government.

The miners want to work. The total investment in the new materials needed for reopening the mines—and not a penny will be spent in this connection by the Federal Government, but reliance will be upon the action already taken by Congress—exceeds one-quarter of a million dollars. Although none of the funds provided by the supplemental bill have yet been spent, many of the workers have placed mortgages on their houses or on their automobiles, and many of their relatives have done likewise, because they wish to have the mines ready for production when the appropriation finally is available.

The act provides for a beginning on January 1, 1962; so when we pass this item and when the money from the supplemental bill—which already has been passed—becomes available, funds will be available for the benefit of these small businessmen. If they were huge corporations, perhaps expenditures by them could be charged off as tax losses. However, they have no profits against which to charge them, but only the unemployment checks which they have been receiving for years.

Now they wish to go to work. They are habitually unemployed, and will continue to be, unless something is done by Congress to fulfill the pledge it made.

This item was authorized by Congress in the act of October 3, 1961. As a result of the work already done in the mines, the allied industries have been greatly benefited; and many of the firms in the East have already found new business in terms of the sale of tractors, diesel trucks, dump trucks, lifts, and pumps—and also including the sale of blasting powder manufactured by the Du Pont Co. in Delaware. So the result has been a chain reaction in terms of more business, some of it in the metropolitan centers.

We have tried to have this measure result in increased employment, and Congress has already passed several bills aimed at the rehabilitation of those affected in the various pockets of continuing unemployment. This measure would relieve only a small percentage of those who are unemployed; but it would also aid in the production of vital minerals, and thus would make it possible to keep alive a production base which would help protect us from the foreign exploitation which would occur if we did not have a domestic supply. In every war—World War I, World War II, and the Korean war—the mines have been reopened, in order to give us the necessary supplies of these vital materials.

The amount authorized for the fiscal year 1963 is $4 900,000, of which $4,500,000 will go directly to the small producers. But we are now asking for only one-half of this amount to be made available for this operation for the last half of fiscal year 1963.

The proposal is based on actual sales by small producers to smelters or other processors. No mine that has produced over 3,000 tons a year of lead and zinc combined is eligible. No mine that was not operating from 1956 to 1961 is eligible. They will be carefully checked as to their ownership, to be sure that only owners of the mines will be eligible to market this ore with the subsidy provision. Thus, it would require administrative action to determine the facts.

The records show that from 1956 to 1961, the base period, some 574 units were producing less than 3,000 tons of lead and zinc combined.

I point out to my distinguished colleague from Ohio that if one of these mines producing less than 3,000 tons, combined, a year produced only 2,000 tons in the base period, that figure would be the basis. The bill provides no windfall even for small producers.

This is not a stockpiling operation. It has to do only with the production of new metal that will move into the market, and it will give U.S. producers an opportunity to supply the lead and zinc this country and the Government must have.

If the proposal is killed, if the mines are left closed, we will not be helping the stockpile. It will still be there. We will only help the big corporations which have the metals that are mined in Peru and other Latin American countries and shipped into this country, and make us dependent on oversea supplies.

The provision is self-liquidating with respect to the volume of work which would be provided, and from which we would benefit.

A downward sliding scale would be provided. This is not permanent legislation. In 1962 it would provide a subsidy to American producers on up to 3,000 tons, combined, of lead and zinc. In 1963, the subsidy would be received only on 2,400 tons, combined, of lead and zinc. In 1964 it would be on 1,800 tons, combined, of lead and zinc. In 1965, it

would be on 1,200 tons, combined, of lead and zinc.

This gives us an opportunity to keep domestic mines alive and provide an opportunity to idle men to be put to work, rather than be dependent on unemployment checks.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I join in the remarks which the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma has made. I think he has presented, in a factual way, the reasons why we should provide funds and implement the purposes of the law enacted on October 3, 1961, Public Law 87–347. If we do not do so, we shall not keep faith with those for whose interest this legislation was enacted.

I sincerely hope that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] will be defeated. If we had defeated the proposed legislation in 1961, there might have been some justification for going to the people and saying, "We did not pass the legislation, so there is no need for providing funds." But we did pass the legislation, and since the passage of the original act, as the Senator from Oklahoma has pointed out, the people involved have rebuilt their plants and are ready to start operating in anticipation of funds being provided. They had a right to do so. I hope the Senate will not adopt the pending amendment.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for yielding to me and commend him for the statement he has made, with which I concur.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

It is true that much hard work has been done in reconditioning the mines as a result of passage of the authorization act. Moreover, since early this year an amount of $4,880,000 has been appropriated for the full calendar year 1962. There was no challenge of the funds provided. The producers went to work. They are ready to produce the metals. It seems to me it is too late to pull the rug out from under those who have waited for years to produce the metals so vitally needed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, first of all, I compliment the Senator from Oklahoma on a very excellent statement, particularly with respect to delineating the areas and fields which these funds would cover. He has described them very well and accurately; and in describing them has made a strong case for the implementation of the legislation by the appropriation of funds.

I also listened with great interest and approbation to the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia, who by his cosponsorship of the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act, and in many other ways, has shown his interest in this essential problem of preservation and development of our natural resources.

I propose to discuss two or three aspects of this question, and I shall not speak at great length, but I wish to begin by saying, as has been repeated over and over on the floor, that this measure has nothing to do with stockpiling.

It was stated on the floor a while ago by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, I believe, that approximately 1,200,000 tons of lead were in the stockpile, but that the need was slightly in excess of 276,000 tons. His figures are accurate, but they paint a completely false picture of the situation. For example, while there are 1,200,000 tons of lead in the stockpile—if that was the figure he used—the annual consumption of lead in the United States for the year 1961 is estimated by the Bureau of Mines, according to its document for 1962 on this subject to be 1,018,000 tons.

The use of lead in the United States has constantly decreased from 1,213,000 tons in 1955 to 1,018,000 tons in 1961. One of the great reasons for that is that polyethylene and aluminum sheathings have replaced lead sheathings for communication cables. So in spite of what our opponents complain of as the amount in the stockpile, we have only 1 year's supply of lead for the United States.

I wish to analyze the figures a little further. In 1955 the United States mined 338,000 tons of lead. The figure increased to 353,000 tons in 1956, and gradually dribbled down to 260,000 tons in 1961. So there has been a decrease in 7 years from 338,000 tons in 1955 to 260,000 tons in 1961.

In 1961 the amount of lead mined in the United States was only 21 percent of the amount of lead used in this country.

Now let us take a look at the zinc picture. In the field of zinc we find that the production of zinc dropped from 515,000 tons in 1955 to 425,000 tons in 1959. It went up to 435,000 tons in 1960, and up to 467,000 tons in 1961. Consumption was 900,000 tons.

Further considering the problems of lead, let us take another look at the countries from which it comes. Twenty-one percent comes from Mexico. Twenty-one percent comes from Australia. Seventeen percent comes from Peru. Fourteen percent comes from Canada. Eight percent comes from Yugoslavia. Nine percent comes from the Republic of South Africa. All other imports total 10 percent.

What is actually happening over the years in respect to both commodities? Using rough figures, it can be said that the picture in the United States is that we mine one-third, we recover one-third, and we import one-third.

What about the lead and zinc that comes into this country? This is a pitiful and pathetic story about an American industry, which should be shouted from the housetops. Three times during the past 6 years the lead and zinc industry has gone to the Tariff Commission for relief. Never has the relief requested under the peril point and escape clause of our tariff laws been granted.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. If I am correct in my understanding, I believe the Senator means that the Tariff Commission found for the industry, but the President did not act.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Tariff Commission has not always found for the industry.

Mr. MONRONEY. There were several unanimous decisions for relief, however, were there not?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes. The last time the Tariff Commission acted, and the President did not follow its recommendations.

Let us consider imported lead, because it represents a pitiful and pathetic tale of what has been done to America.

The present market price for lead in New York is 9½ cents a pound. The present market price for zinc is 12 cents a pound. If we add those together, we get 21½ cents a pound as the combined price of lead and zinc.

In most instances, although not always, lead and zinc are taken from the same mine. Testimony which has been repeatedly given before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate shows that 21½ cents a pound is at least 9 cents a pound less than the cost of producing lead and zinc as a combined product in the United States. In other words, in the United States lead and zinc cannot be produced profitably for less than 30, 31, or 31½ cents a pound.

Why is this the case? There is one basic reason. The explanation is the cheap labor market which exists in foreign countries.

The industry has gradually declined year after year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a document prepared for me, which shows the production of lead and zinc in Colorado. It gives a graphic illustration for the lead and zinc industry of that State from 1948 to 1960. It shows that the number of mines has decreased from 159 to 50. It shows that the number of tons of lead produced has decreased from 25,143 to 18,080. It shows that the value of lead produced has gone down from approximately $9 million to $4,230,720. It shows that the value of zinc produced has gone down from $12 to $8 million.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Production of lead and zinc in Colorado

Year	Number of mines estimated by U.S. Bureau of Mines	Tons of material treated	Tons of lead produced	Tons of zinc produced	Value of lead produced	Value of zinc produced	Average price of lead	Average price of zinc
							Cents	*Cents*
1948	159	692,991	25,143	45,164	$9,001,194	$12,013,624	17.9	13.3
1949	151	584,193	26,853	47,703	8,485,548	11,830,344	15.8	12.4
1950	124	796,269	27,007	45,776	7,291,890	13,000,384	13.5	14.2
1951	116	1,167,507	30,336	55,714	10,496,256	20,279,896	17.3	18.2
1952	109	1,132,014	30,066	53,203	9,681,252	17,663,396	16.1	16.6
1953	57	906,321	21,754	37,809	5,699,548	8,696,070	13.1	11.5
1954	67	721,860	17,823	35,150	4,883,502	7,592,400	13.7	10.8
1955	72	708,907	15,805	35,350	4,709,890	8,696,100	14.9	12.3
1956	72	995,487	19,856	40,246	6,234,784	11,027,404	15.7	13.7
1957	55	948,128	21,003	47,000	6,006,858	10,904,000	14.3	11.6
1958	37	750,930	14,112	37,132	3,302,208	7,574,928	11.7	10.2
1959	27	671,699	12,907	35,388	2,968,610	8,139,240	11.5	11.5
1960	50	745,271	18,080	31,278	4,230,720	8,069,724	11.7	12.9

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have in my files similar documents with respect to every other State which produces lead and zinc. If it were not that it would encumber the RECORD, I would make them all a part of the RECORD. I am willing to supply them to any Senator who requests them, and they will be available for information.

For the State of Colorado the table gives a graphic description of what has happened.

I see the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is in the Chamber. I should like to have his attention. A while ago the Senator from Rhode Island directed an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma concerning the national-interest implications of this proposal. I should like to attempt to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. PASTORE. I should appreciate it, because I think Senators are very much interested in what the proposal means to the national welfare and to the security of the country, and what it would mean in case of an emergency, if the mines were closed and could not be reopened.

Mr. ALLOTT. I heard the Senator's question. It intrigued me when he addressed the question to the Senator from Oklahoma. I should like to attempt at least, to answer it.

I have already pointed out that the amount in the stockpile—which cannot be put on the market without the consent of Congress—is, according to the figures of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, approximately 1.2 million tons. This represents about a year's consumption of lead. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, the estimated consumption of lead in the United States last year was 1,018,000 tons, a little less than consumption has been in the past. Roughly, the same figures apply to zinc.

The point is that even if the lead were released from the stockpile, which could only be done by act of Congress, the lead released would supply this country for only 1 year.

There are some who today believe implicitly that if we are to be engaged in any war we are to be engaged in an all-out pushbutton war which will be over in a few minutes. The senior Senator from Colorado does not so believe. We are all entitled to our own judgments. This problem involves the question military logistics.

Those of us who saw the oil tankers burning off Miami during the last World War cannot forget it. If we ever get into any protracted type of conventional or semi-conventional war we shall be up against the same things we were up against previously. We paid through our noses for every metal we obtained; manganese, lead, zinc, fluorspar, and many other metals.

From the standpoint of the national interest, at best we have a 1-year supply in the stockpile. From the standpoint of the national interest, this supply is not too much to have on hand, when we may face a protracted conflict. A protracted conflict is not out of the question, even with all our nuclear instruments of war.

The second point I wish to make is the point made by the Senator from Oklahoma, which I thought was a very cogent one. In the majority of instances, when a mine is closed it is ruined. The expense of reopening the mine is so great that the mine may be lost forever. Therefore, closing the mine and keeping it closed for any length of time may cause the loss of a great natural wealth. This is true of lead mining. It is true of zinc mining. It is true of many other kinds of mining.

There is a third and very great and potent reason why the interests of this country demand that we keep this industry on its feet. This concerns the know-how of mining. A hard rock miner is not made in a day, or in a year, or even in 3 or 4 years. A hard rock miner is made from years of experience.

We have observed the effect of 2 or 3 years of closing mines. If we do not do something to help this industry we shall soon lose the know-how of mining. It will be impossible to reopen the mines, because it will be impossible to find those with the know-how to mine these metals. The problem is that simple.

In summary, from the standpoint of national interest and national consumption, the so-called overhang of surplus factor is insignificant.

What we would have to pay if we were forced to import these metals during a period of crisis, makes the proposed program a necessity.

Second, we face the prospect of losing many of our mines.

Third, we face the prospect of losing the know-how of mining.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that those are the reasons why I believe the country has a great national interest in the program.

I point out that in Colorado most of our mines are closed. Among them are the Eagle mine of the New Jersey Zinc Co. at Gilman, the Treasury Tunnel-Black Bear-Smuggler Union group in San Miguel County, owned by Idarado Mining Co., the Emperius Mining Co. of Creede, Mineral County, the Rico Argentine Mining Co., at Rico, Dolores County. The Standard Metals Corp. has just established a large zinc ore mine reserve at Silverton in San Juan County. Believe it or not, those companies cannot open their mines and produce the wealth of our country because cheap labor abroad has so depressed the price that they cannot compete. We have great wealth-producing assets in our country which are idle because we cannot afford to produce the wealth.

For a moment I should like to speak about what the importation of lead and zinc does.

Reference was made by a Senator a while ago to the lead and zinc smelter at Leadville, Colo. That has been one of the great industrial plants of the central portion of our State for many years. What I am about to say is hard to believe. The price of lead has been so far depressed that for the past 4 or 5 years the lead and zinc facilities at Leadville have been operated on lead and zinc ore transported from Mexico, across the Rio Grande, 10,500 feet into the air at Leadville, Colo., where the smelting takes place. It is impossible to imagine a more uneconomic operation in terms of common ordinary horsesense. Yet that is what has happened. Today the lead-zinc smelter at Leadville is closed. It is being dismantled. It is significant to note that what lead and zinc is mined in Colorado today goes down to El Paso, Tex. So far as I know, there is no production of lead and zinc in Texas in any significant quantity. Why is that smelter located in El Paso? The lead and zinc smelter is there for only one reason, and that reason is the cheap labor available for lead and zinc imported from Mexico.

There are other ways in which I would like to have attempted to resolve this problem, but they were not available to use. We were turned down again and again. The distinguished former Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, offered to the Congress two different

ways of handling the problem, and the Congress turned both of them down. The first suggestion was an import excise tax. Congress would not accept that idea. Then the Secretary offered a tariff bill. Congress would not accept that solution.

So today the method embodied in the bill is the only way that I know of to try to keep an industry alive, unless we should adopt the tariff or the quota routes, which Congress has refused to do. The proposal is the only way to keep alive an industry whose very livelihood affects the vitality of America. It would not take long during a period of war and crisis to deplete all the stocks we have in out stockpile in this country. If we are to protect the national interests of our country, from the standpoint of availability and price, the destruction of our own natural resources, and keeping available the know-how of mining, we must adopt the suggested program. As the Senator from Oklahoma has ably pointed out, in effect, we have promised the people this program. The Senate passed an appropriation bill earlier this year. The Senate should pass the measure again and reject the amendment which has been offered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President. I associate myself with the remarks of my colleague [Mr. MONRONEY] in opposition to the Williams amendment. I also wish to congratulate the two distinguished Senators from Colorado for their very able presentations on the questions involved. I am not surprised at the opposition to the very modest provision in the pending bill—a little over $2 million—which is intended to carry the program through the second half of the fiscal year 1963. The opposition has been addressed principally to criticism of the stockpile. The program which would be aided by the appropriation contributes nothing to the stockpile. The production which would be the basis for the limited production payments made possible by the appropriation must go into the market and be sold in the market in order to make the producer eligible for the benefits of the bill and the appropriation. The production would not compete with the stockpile. It would compete with imports. The producers are the smallest of those who compete for a part of the domestic market. As it is now, the only American producers who can compete with importation of lead and zinc from foreign countries are the big producers. They would receive nothing from the bill.

The program represents the survival of a limited number of small producers, in the hope that the day will come when the domestic market will not be so heavily burdened with low-cost foreign production that they can survive in this great country by providing a very limited percentage of the lead and zinc used in this great economy, without having to be kept alive with a transfusion of production payments. The fact is incontestible and uncontested that without the appropriation, the group of small producers will be pushed over the precipice into bankruptcy and out of business. After having twice passed the authorizing legislation for the program, and after having very wisely provided the money to start the program in the last half of the fiscal year 1962 and the first half of the fiscal year 1963, I do not believe that the Senate will now abandon that small group of domestic producers in a manner that would result in economic destruction and oblivion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in stating my reasons for supporting the amendment, of which the Senator from Delaware and I are sponsors.

First, the records clearly show that there is a great excess of lead and zinc in our stockpile. The figures as of June 11 show that we had 1,302,000 tons of lead, at a time when the strategic requirements called for 287,000 tons. The supply is three and a half times more than we need.

With regard to zinc, as of June 11 we had on hand 1,580,000 tons. The objective for strategic purposes was 178,000 tons. Thus, the supply is eight times the need.

We have a vast stockpile of minerals. Minerals are running out of our ears. I spoke with the representative of the General Services Administration, and those are the terms he used—"Zinc and lead are running out of our ears."

By the pending bill we contemplate encouraging the mining of more lead and zinc. We cannot reconcile those two facts. In the bill a limitation is placed on the amount that may be expended annually to subsidize the producers. To begin with, the amount authorized is not adequate to care for the demands that will be made.

Four million five hundred thousand dollars per year would never take care of the demands. Supplemental aid would be asked for. I document that statement by the testimony in the hearings, in which the expert witness said that $6 million at least would be needed.

What is the subsidy? I want the newspapers of Ohio to carry this story back to my State: $3,750 per worker would be paid to keep the mines open for the mining of lead; $1,750 per man to keep the mines open for the mining of zinc. That is a rather significant sum of money. I cannot subscribe to the proposal.

I have a further reason. If we establish a precedent with respect to lead and zinc mines, where are we to stop? I heard the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] say at one time that there ought to be a subsidy for textiles—or perhaps it was for watches. If we are to subsidize zinc mines and lead mines and fluorspar mines, how long will it be before Ohio industrialists will say we should subsidize the machine tool industry, the bicycle manufacturing industry, and possibly the baseball glove industry? Where shall we stop?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield for a question.

Mr. PASTORE. It will have to be for an observation. The Senator from Ohio referred to what he said was the position of the Senator from Rhode Island. I have never said that we should subsidize the textile industry; nor has the textile industry asked for a subsidy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am very glad to hear that.

Mr. PASTORE. All we asked for was that there be a limitation on the importation, which was crucifying the textile industry.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That gives strength to the argument I am making. If we are to subsidize the lead and zinc industry, I ask, What answer shall we give to the other industries of the country which become affected and which are not able to compete?

I have the deepest respect for the integrity of the several Senators who have spoken. I know that their basis was genuine. They want to help the people within their States. I am of the belief that what we are doing eventually will kill the goose that has laid the golden egg. We cannot continue in this way without eventually destroying the system under which we live and have thrived so richly.

That is all I have to say on this measure. I have a deep conviction that my approach is sound. By that statement I am not casting any reflections upon the position taken by other Senators who have spoken on this subject.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I wish to ask a question or two with respect to the figures the Senator has used. As I understood the Senator, he said that this would mean a subsidy of $3,750 per man in one of the two industries. Was it lead or zinc?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Lead.

Mr. MUSKIE. I wonder if the Senator would explain how he arrived at that figure. I am particularly interested in knowing the total number of employees the Senator believes to be involved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To begin with, 2 years ago, in a colloquy with the Senator from Colorado I asked him how many employees were required to mine 2,000 tons of lead. He said 8. I calculated what the cost per man would be with 8 employees, and it ran to $10,000 or more. Then hurriedly messengers were sent out to obtain figures that were supposed to be accurate. It was found that instead of 8, the number was 30 men. 30 workers were needed to mine 2,000 tons of lead. In the pending bill 1,500 tons are involved, or three-quarters of 2,000. So, if it required 40 men to mine 2,000 tons, it would take 30 men to mine 1,500 tons. That is the base from which I began. Let me give the Senator the base figures. The price declared in the bil lfor lead is 14½ cents. As of last Friday, I believe, lead was selling at 9½ cents a pound. That leaves a difference of 5 cents. The subsidy is 75 percent of the difference.

That means that the subsidy is 3¾ cents a pound. There are 2,000 pounds to a ton to be subsidized. That amounts to more than $5 a ton. The maximum for which payment can be made is 1,500

tons. One thousand five hundred tons multiplied by 75 gives a figure of $112,500. Thirty workers would be employed, which means that the cost would be $3,750 per man.

Those figures cannot be disputed. I repeat that that type of subsidy cannot be justified. I should like to have the newspapermen let the people of Ohio know about this.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. Does the Senator have any figure on the total employment in the mines?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall show the Senator how this information developed in the hearings. The situation is very startling. The fear was expressed that some Senator, on the floor of the Senate, might begin to point out the abnormal cost. Assuming the figures to be correct, this is how the question about the excessive cost was answered in the hearings.

One witness said:

> Now, it would seem to me we have to justify, if we can, and I am sure we can, that we are doing this not only for employment.

In the hearings, reasons were sought which would support this figure. Then the witness said:

> We are doing this not only for production. But we are doing this for the purpose of holding mines in a system and a standby for national defense and conservation. And while you are doing it, you can show how you can enrich the economy at the same time.

With respect to the figures, the testimony shows the following :

> If there are 215 mines that will be reached by this bill, and if those mines are only 8 percent of the total production, and then, if we are going to put in about $5 million subsidy to those mines alone, and then the further "if," if we have about 20 men to a mine, or some 44,000 people—

I believe that figure should be 4,400—this is one of the arguments they make on the floor. They show a huge subsidy of $5 million going to a very small group with a very small percentage of production.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Ohio used the figure "$4,500,000" a year for operation, and this would amount to $100 a man.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would amount to $1,000.

Mr. MUSKIE. The amount is $4,500,000 for 4,400 men.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the very point I am making. The money now proposed to be authorized would prove to be grossly inadequate to take care of the responsibility.

The program has been established on one basis, but the Committee on Finance has limited the amount to $4,500,000. The point I make is that the amount of money is not adequate. The amount which can now be paid is limited. The bill does not provide enough money.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the argument has been made that the proposed subsidy for lead and zinc has no connection with the stockpile program. I disagree completely with the reasoning behind that argument. The purpose of the whole stockpile program as outlined in the legislation which Congress passed was—to assure the Nation of sources of vital metals in time of emergency or war. There is not a Senator who will dispute the fact that the stockpile program originally was started to assure the Nation's source of vital metals in time of emergency or war. That fact was recognized by all.

Now, what did the committee report on the bill authorizing this lead and zinc subsidy give last year as a reason for its adoption? I quote:

> Conserve domestic reserves of lead and zinc in order to assure the Nation's source of these vital metals in time of emergency or war.

In presenting both programs the same argument was used.

As the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, as a result of our original stockpiling we have accumulated 3½ times as much lead as is needed and 8 times as much zinc as is needed. The President of the United States has charged that this excessive accumulation of metals and minerals in the stockpiles represents a national scandal. Upon the request of the President the Senator from Missouri has begun an investigation as to past procurement policies. Here is a chance to correct the condition.

I have already quoted from the committee report on the bill as reported to the Senate. I quote again from page 3 of the committee report on H.R. 84:

> The purpose of H.R. 84 is to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small producers and, at the same time, conserve domestic reserves of lead and zinc in order to assure the Nation's source of these vital metals in time of emergency or war.

Yes, that statement was made in justification of the subsidy program, and it is in substance the same as the statement made to justify the original stockpile program. Let us stop deluding ourselves. This subsidy program is a part of the stockpile discussion. It is impossible to criticize one and defend the other.

Under this proposal lead and zinc would not be added to our national stockpile inventories. That is true. But to the extent we subsidize expanded production of these minerals we increase supply and hinder our liquidation program. Appropriating millions for this subsidy program is in direct contradiction of the President's proposal that a start be made to reduce the excessive inventory of the stockpile. On that point I do not believe there can be any argument.

The Department of the Interior, in a letter signed by John M. Kelly, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated July 21, 1961, opposed the enactment of the bill.

President Eisenhower in 1960 vetoed a bill proposing a subsidy for lead and zinc in the manner as provided in the bill signed last year by President Kennedy.

Under date of September 19, 1961, when the bill was originally passed, I received a letter from Frank B. Ellis, Director of the Office of Defense and Civilian Mobilization. I had asked Mr. Ellis whether there was any justification for the lead and zinc subsidy program in the interest of national defense. I read from the reply by Mr. Ellis:

> This has reference to your letter of August 29, 1961, in which you ask six questions on lead and zinc and on S. 1747, which has been reported by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
>
> The replies to your questions are:
>
> 1. In view of the status of our present inventories of lead and zinc we would have no defense justification for recommending the enactment of S. 1747.

Earlier today I placed in the RECORD a letter from the Department of the Interior; and in it Secretary Udall says that no commitments have been made and no commitments will be made until the money is available. So this amendment does not involve any reneging on contractual obligations. Regardless of whether I favor or oppose such a provision, I recognize that once a commitment is made we are obligated to provide the necessary funds. But in the letter the Secretary of the Interior states that no commitments have been made and none will be made until the money is made available.

So as we prepare to vote on this amendment I think we should ask ourselves whether we believe in and concur in the President's statement that an orderly liquidation of some of the metals placed in the strategic stockpile should begin at this time so as to decrease the $8 billion stockpile, or whether we wish to have more production and thus aggravate the existing stockpile situation by building up additional inventories.

Some opponents to our amendment have expressed horror at the thought that anyone would suggest that we begin to liquidate the stockpile of these strategic minerals, and references have been made to the great unemployment problem which would be created and the great disruption of the market which would be caused. But I point out that I was only quoting what President Kennedy himself said when he recommended that between $3 billion and $3,500,000,000 worth of strategic minerals in our stockpile be liquidated in view of the fact that we have no need for them. Are they accusing their President of trying to create unemployment?

Senators who do not wish to have these inventories liquidated should frankly say so and should not stick their tongues in their cheeks and say to the taxpayers, "We want to liquidate these national stockpiles, and we agree with the President that we have 8 or 10 times as much in the stockpiles as we need. Yes, we express very great concern over the cost, but by our votes we will arrange to have more of these minerals purchased for the stockpile."

In short, Mr. President, Senators should be realistic. Of course, some market conditions will be disrupted if liquidation of the stockpiles is begun. The Senator from Missouri himself said he recommended getting rid of some of the materials in the stockpiles for which we have no need by using some of the materials in connection with the Government's contracts. Certainly that

would likewise disrupt market conditions to some extent.

No one is proposing that all the materials be dumped on the market at one time; that would create chaos, both domestically and internationally. But we must make a start or we will never liquidate the excessive stockpile inventories. The market will be affected to a certain degree, but there is no alternative. If we are unwilling to face this problem and to deal with it, even at the expense of having some effect on market conditions, then let us stop talking about it. Without excusing the President of his responsibility, the Senate should frankly admit that this situation has been largely brought about by Congress itself. After all, every dime spent on the stockpiling program has been spent as a result of action taken by Congress. So Senators should not talk about how horrified they are over what has been done, for whatever was done was as a result of congressional action.

I believe the Senate is ready to vote on the question of the adoption of this amendment. I realize that this item relates to an amount of less than $3 million, but the principle involved is most important. Unless Senators are willing to vote to put a stop to this mineral subsidy program they should stop criticizing the excessive cost. As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has pointed out, hundreds of millions of dollars are invested in the stockpiles of metals which we do not need. So the question is whether Senators desire to cut down on these unneeded supplies or whether they wish to continue to provide subsidies for expanded production. That question will be answered by the votes which Senators cast on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], on behalf of himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], to strike out, on page 20, lines 19 through 23.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER], would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 88 Leg.]

YEAS—36

Beall	Ervin	Murphy
Boggs	Fong	Pastore
Bush	Goldwater	Pell
Butler	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Capehart	Hruska	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Saltonstall
Clark	Jordan	Scott
Cooper	Keating	Smathers
Curtis	Lausche	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Miller	Thurmond
Douglas	Morton	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—52

Allott	Hartke	Morse
Anderson	Hayden	Moss
Bartlett	Hill	Muskie
Bennett	Humphrey	Neuberger
Bible	Jackson	Pearson
Burdick	Kefauver	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Kerr	Randolph
Cannon	Kuchel	Smith, Mass.
Carlson	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Carroll	Long, Hawaii	Stennis
Church	Long, La.	Symington
Dodd	Magnuson	Talmadge
Eastland	Mansfield	Wiley
Ellender	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McClellan	Yarborough
Gore	McGee	Young, Ohio
Gruening	Metcalf	
Hart	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—12

Aiken	Cotton	Johnston
Byrd, Va.	Fulbright	McNamara
Case, N.J.	Hickey	Robertson
Chavez	Holland	Tower

So the amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS for himself and Mr. LAUSCHE was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ECONOMIC "MYTHOLOGY"

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, if there are still any doubts about why the business community and the American people are lacking confidence in the administration's economic policies, the President's speech at Yale ought to tie them down. I believe everyone in this country is taking his confusion and uncertainty directly from the White House.

In effect, Mr. President, the Chief Executive wrote off the books as "mythology" everything in the economic situation that disturbs the American people as well as foreign governments.

The budget, he tells us, is "not simply irrelevant; it is actively misleading" and, consequently, it should not be regarded as a measure of soundness. And since the President has decided the budget does not count, there can be no "sophisticated" reason for anyone wanting to see it balanced.

The President also consigns to "mythology" the argument that Federal deficits lead to inflation. And, having adopted this comfortable new theory, he goes all out to find justification for more public debt. He tells us that it is only a myth that the national debt is growing at a dangerously rapid rate. He says—and if Senators want more confusion, here it is—that public confidence is both "a matter of myth and a matter of truth."

Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of this body would be happy if we could solve our public debt problems through the expediency of "mythology." Woud it not be nice if we could forget the $9.4 billion which we must pay every year in interest on the national debt? We might just get the President to call it a "myth" and write the whole thing off.

And, since the matter of public confidence is part myth, I guess we can forget the billions of dollars lost in the recent stock-market plunge, the lag in capital investment, the problem of unemployment, and the nagging persistence of our adverse balance of international payments.

Yes, Mr. President, we can now rest easy. Everything that the proponents of sound and responsible fiscal policy have been worrying about just does not exist. It is all a myth.

In conclusion, let me say that if anyone is confused over the President's remarks, an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning should clarify everything. It says:

> The President did well to summon the Nation to confront its hard economic problems on another plane, and in a different arena. In a world of rapidly changing circumstances we ought to avoid emotional and quasi-religious attachment to formulate for the solution of economic problems deriving their sacred character from myth and legend unrelated to contemporary crisis.

As James Reston of the New York Times recently said:

> This is the silly season.

The President—the administration—has indeed summoned the Nation to confront its problems on another plane—the plane of mythology which exists only in White House fancy.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Too Sophisticated by Far," published in this morning's Wall

Street Journal, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOO SOPHISTICATED BY FAR

The Nation's economic discourse, President Kennedy believes, is imprisoned in myths and cliches. He wants to liberate it into the clear air of reality, so that we can talk and act intelligently about the "sophisticated and technical" questions that are the real economic problems of our times.

Everyone ought to be in favor of that. The trouble is that Mr. Kennedy chooses to ignore the enormous mythology that comes under the mislabeled heading of liberalism. The further trouble is that some administration officials want to get so sophisticated about such matters as the public debt that they will be able to persuade the people it isn't really a debt at all, or anyway nothing to worry about.

More than a trace of this kind of "sophistication" showed up in the President's commencement address at Yale yesterday. Consider, for example, the question of the size of the Federal Government and its role in the economy.

While admitting that big Government has its dangers, Mr. Kennedy charged that it is a myth that Government is steadily getting bigger and worse. How come? Because, if we leave aside defense and space expenditures—which is leaving aside quite a lot—then the Federal Government has expanded less than any other major sector of national life since World War II.

The sophisticated device here is to argue that something is not as big as it seems because it is not yet as big as something else. Obviously such a rationalization is a carte blanche for unlimited Government spending.

Unfortunately for the argument, the rapid growth of Government is there for all to see. It is a fact; it is reality. And equally plain is the manner of its growth—not only defense, but the constant addition of more political subsidies to more groups.

President Kennedy says people should stop talking as though this were the 1930's instead of the 1960's. But who plays the old records of the thirties more tiresomely than the Kennedy administration itself? Public works, youth conservation corps, spending and deficits; the whole Kennedy domestic program is a rehash of the nostrums of the depression.

The fresh economic thinking today is to be found elsewhere. It lies in the argument that a trimmed-down Government, with substantial tax cuts made possible by lower costs, would release the energies of the people and bring about the prized economic growth. It would also do much to solve those "sophisticated and technical" problems the President mentioned, like maintaining the value of the dollar abroad.

Instead of offering real hope for the Nation's economic future, the President merely offers more justifications for more Government growth. Thus we are told that the "conventional" Federal budget is "actively misleading" because it ignores trust funds and counts capital outlays as spending instead of investment. On the basis of either the cash budget or the "national income accounts" budget, some deficits would turn out to have been surpluses.

Yet again, the facts get in the way of the rationalization. Trust funds by their nature should not be counted as general revenues, and the kind of wasteful capital spending the Government indulges in certainly is spending, rather than investment somehow comparable to that of a private company. The virtue of the conventional budget is that it tells us the truth, and the sorry truth is that Federal income almost never equals Federal outgo.

The President is absolutely right that we need fresh insight and hard thought instead of myths and tired slogans. That is why it is so unfortunate to have him advocating the dreariest and most threadbare economic prescription of all.

And let us remember that far more than theory is at stake. A policy based on the shopworn mythology of state spending, planning, intervention, and control will affect the lives of all of us and largely determine our standing in the world. Meantime, the economic debate can hardly be very useful if it gets so "sophisticated" that it plays tricks with facts.

Mr. SCOTT and Mr. SYMINGTON addressed the Chair.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the Senator agree with me, speaking of myths, that in the Yale speech the President has "mythed" the point?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might put it another way—he was a "mythery" guest.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I was listening to my able colleague from Arizona, who mentioned the fall of the stock market. Some of my friends have blamed the President for the fall in the stock market. They concentrate their criticism on four points: the fact that our taxes are high; that the budget has not been balanced for some time; that there was intervention in the steel situation; and that some say labor has undue influence in this administration.

I present for consideration of the Senate that in October 1929, I was working in several corporations. At that time there was a considerably sharper break in the stock market, with much more disastrous results. It is interesting to note that at that time the budget was balanced, taxes were low, there was no Government intervention, and there were no large labor unions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not know the point the Senator is attempting to make, but I am glad he has made those remarks. I, too, was working at that period of history. I recall that the Government started then what it is still attempting to do, which is to pull the country out of a hole by government intervention. That still has not been done. If it had not been for World War II, we still would be in pretty bad shape.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, only to add to the gaiety, I saw a man with a smiling face the other day who said, "I haven't lost my confidence, I've only lost my money."

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit a motion to recommit, which I ask to have stated for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN, moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the bill back to the Senate in a total amount for all purposes and items which shall not exceed the sum of $868,595,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to recommit the bill, with instructions.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President I shall not take very long. The motion is to recommit the bill to the committee with instructions to return it at the House figure. It would cut the proposed appropriation by $48 million. The Senate figure is $48 million above the House figure. It is $121 million above the appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1962. In offering the motion in that fashion, I intend no reflection upon the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I served on that committee for a long time. I served on the House Appropriations Committee for a long time—on one or the other of the two committees at least 17 years—so I would be the last Member of the Senate ever to reflect upon the committee.

Other considerations support the motion to recommit.

For a long time we have undertaken somehow to bring our budget into balance. I was a member of the Reorganization Committee of the House and Senate in 1946. In the act that was passed by both Houses there was included a provision for a legislative budget. It provided that the four committees—the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the two Appropriations Committees—were either by themselves or through subcommittees to meet. They were authorized and directed to meet and to report a legislative budget along with estimated receipts and estimated expenditures. If the receipts exceeded the expenditures, the debt would be reduced by that amount. The reduction was automatic. If expenditures exceeded receipts, the provision in the Reorganization Act called for a resolution that it was the sense of Congress that the public debt be increased by a like amount.

We invested great hopes in that provision. Under that section we met once. I shall never forget the meeting. We could not agree. Finally we reduced the number to a subcommittee of five from each of the four committees. For nearly a month we labored in the hope of reporting a legislative budget. That was probably in the fiscal year 1947—15 years ago—and, Mr. President, that committee has never met since that time, nor has that section of the Reorganization Act ever been repealed.

So notwithstanding all the effort that was made in order to give legislative character to a budget, the fact of the matter is it was never consummated. So

we are still confronted with the problem of continuing deficits.

Eighteen days hence, June 30, will mark the end of the fiscal year. From all signs and tokens it would appear that the deficit for the fiscal year 1962 will be $7 billion plus. There are estimates now that for the fiscal year 1963, which will be a year hence, the deficit could be $4 billion or more. That remains to be seen. But it is pretty certain that there will be a deficit instead of a surplus submitted in the President's budget in January of this year.

In connection with all of this, we hear talk of a tax reduction. The President and Secretary of the Treasury Dillon have both proclaimed one. If there is a tax reduction, obviously we shall add to the deficit.

I was rather curious about that part of the statement of Mr. Dillon in which he said we must find new loopholes from which to recapture $5 billion to offset the drop in revenue as a result of the tax reduction.

The water is all going to come out of the same well. I do not know where we will get it, but certainly the impact will be exactly the same.

In his budget message in January, the President observed that in a planned deficit increase is the risk of inflation, but Mr. Dillon in his recent speech in New York said that:

> A deficit is inflationary only if there is a strong demand for goods which places a heavy pressure upon supply.

If a tax cut leaves more spending money in the pocketbooks of individuals and corporations, and is designed to stimulate consumer spending, how in the world would we miss the inflationary fever that would go along with it? If that is true, the price increase that would come later would vitiate all the benefits of a tax increase.

What I say may sound like a hedge, but we shall be confronted with a proposal for a tax reduction. Logically I do not see how any Member of this or the other body could support a tax reduction without first looking at the expenditures, doing some work in that field, and cutting the budget.

These are the factors in the whole tax equation: It would increase the 1963 deficit. It would increase the interest outlay, which is already $1 out of every $10 in the 1963 budget which must be set aside for interest to our people for the purpose of using their money.

It would increase the public debt. I read that, shortly after the House gets through, there will be before the Senate a proposal, to raise the debt by another $6 billion or $8 billion.

All that will have an impact upon private spending for capital investment. Therein is the secret of more jobs and business expansion. But I do not know how we could encourage it unless the Government should take the lead in the field of spending.

We have the problem of a foreign reaction. I have talked with some who are skilled in the international field. I worry a little about what would happen if those abroad in the central banks and elsewhere, and particularly holders of short-term and long-term U.S. paper, should get the idea that we are not going to face our responsibilities in the budget field, and their confidence should become further diminished. What would we say if they should start dumping securities and demanding from our dwindling gold stock the necessary legal reserve against demand deposits and Federal Reserve notes? We have only a little more than $5 billion in our reserve gold account. We have been steadily losing gold. I think it is one of the most delicate and dangerous problems that confronts the country at the present time.

Mr. President, out of sheer conviction that the Congress will have to do something in the field of economy, this is a modest beginning to cut $48 million from a bill that presents a total of $916 million as reported to the Senate.

Having served on the Appropriations Committee, I know it is not easy for a Senator by his vote to repudiate the work of the committee, but that cannot be my concern. I have an individual responsibility with respect to the stability and to the solvency of the country. Looking over the general picture in the other body, I was not a little distressed to learn that there has been hardly any attempt at economy. But it will have to start somewhere.

In my present frame of mind I intend to offer motions to recommit on every appropriation bill that reaches the floor of the Senate, because I cannot charge my conscience with having done nothing in that field, and ultimately being confronted with a proposal for a tax reduction, which would only add to the deficit, and which has such a commanding appeal to citizens, individual and corporate, in all walks of life. That would be an awkward situation, indeed..

That is the whole argument, Mr. President. On the motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois and I have served on the Appropriations Committee together. I should like to ask him whether it would not have been better, if the Senator felt the way he has expressed himself about every appropriation bill, if he would appear before the committee with reference to the items in the bill. Why does he not do that rather than make his motion now at the end of the consideration of the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I serve on the Judiciary Committee and on eight subcommittees.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I serve on some committees, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I serve on the Committee on Rules and Administration. There are a few chores, also, that go along with being minority leader.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I can compress anything more into an 18-hour day, whenever the Senate is in session, I shall be very glad to return to my old committee. If my friend will find me the time, I will be delighted to do it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I can find the Senator the time. He can come before the Committee on Appropriations and take up item after item, if he can suggest that we eliminate any items. He should do that rather than come to the floor of the Senate at the end of the consideration of the bill and suggest that it be done in this fashion. He suggests that he will make the same motion on every appropriation bill. The Appropriations Committee did not have the benefit of his ideas and advice. We do not know why he should want to eliminate one item and retain another in the bill. The consideration of this kind of bill is a very difficult job, as the Senator well knows. I wonder why he would not agree to appear before the committee and say, "I want this item knocked out." I might vote with him on several items.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not beguiled by the argument of my distinguished friend from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is only a suggestion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He knows what problems would be involved in going through these items one by one in every appropriation bill. If he can persuade my distinguished friend from Montana to give me a staff of 100 people, I will get the job done. It will take a lot of work to do it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator will give me a list, I will present it for him to the Committee on Appropriations. Let him give me a list of the items that he wishes to have eliminated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And how will the Senator present that list?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will take it to my friend the Senator from Arizona, and to the Senator from North Dakota, and say, "The distinguished minority leader thinks this is wrong."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have made that identical argument myself. I am not deluded by it. There is a huge Appropriations Committee in the other body. It is an exclusive committee. I served on it, and when I did, I served on no other committee in the House. Every subcommittee is an exclusive one. Members of the House Appropriations Committee serve on only one subcommittee. As a result, they do their work very well. They examine every item in the bill. I always felt as though I was a sort of court of appeals as a member of the Senate committee, because usually we considered only those items on which the agencies protested a cut, and we worked on those items. That constituted perhaps 15 or 20 percent of the bill.

It should not be said that this proposal is capricious or arbitrary. There is a great deal of work behind the House committee in its action on the appropriation bill. I can say that without in any way demeaning the work, the diligence, and the devotion of the Senate committee. I hold in my hand the record of the House hearings. It must weigh at least 6 pounds.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am trying to understand the nature of the motion of the Senator from Illinois. With all due regard to wanting fiscal stability, it seems to me that his motion is in the

nature of a meat-ax approach, without reference to any one item in the bill; or it is an effort to rubberstamp the House bill. If that is the purpose of the Senator's motion that the bill be recommitted, I presume the result would be that we would have before us the same bill as the House passed. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator can make his own argument on that point.

Mr. MONRONEY. I want to know on what we are voting. I want to know whether we would be voting on the exact amount that is in the House bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then we would merely rubberstamp the action of the House of Representatives. The Senate, which is trying to keep alive a bicameral system of double checks and balances, would not have anything to say about it. The minority leader is asking us to accept the House bill. The Senate would in effect say that it does not have intelligence enough in its committee structure to consider the line items that are open. We are asked to use a meat-ax approach, instead of a surgeon's scalpel. When I am asked merely to rubberstamp the action of the House of Representatives and say that we are not competent or intelligent enough to consider these items, but must rubberstamp the House bill, I fear I cannot go along with the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This is not a meat-ax approach, because if it were, we would have to charge the Committee on Appropriations of the House with having turned out a meat-ax bill. If the Senator wishes to make the other argument, about the rubberstamp, that is all right with me. He can make that explanation if he likes. I am never afraid to go along with the House figure. If I had had more time I probably could have devised another formula. I may arrive at another one with respect to the other bills. Under the circumstances, I will press this motion on the pending bill, and see whether there is some economy sentiment in the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not think the Senator from Illinois should say that the members of the Committee on Appropriations have acted with utter disregard for economy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some of the items in the bill might be items on which I would vote with the Senator from Illinois. There are others with respect to which I would disagree with him. I would want to know what items should be cut out and which should be kept in.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Does the Senator serve on the subcommittee that heard the testimony on the pending bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I am not a member of that subcommittee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If he were on the subcommittee, obviously he would know what had taken place.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am quite familiar with the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Before the full committee got through with the bill the distinguished Senator from Washington would have a chance to pass on every item.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I voted with the committee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I were to vote with the Senator from Illinois I would not know which items should be cut out, because some of the House items were given serious consideration. We voted for some and we voted against others.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a member of the full committee the Senator obviously was familiar with it. He knows whether the bill will stand a $48 million cut.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I am constrained to vote for the motion to recommit the bill. I could be persuaded to vote against it if I could have assurance from the leadership on the other side regarding the specific items that will be cut out of the President's budget to make room for the $750 million in public works programs for which the Senate voted recently and which are not in the President's budget. I believe that the President was sincere at the time he made a promise to the American people to have a balanced budget in the coming fiscal year. Of course, a promise, in itself, is worth nothing. Delivery is what counts. Delivery must take place here. If I could have assurances as to what items would be cut back to make room for the $750 million in public works programs, which are not in the budget, I would vote against the motion of my leader. If I cannot have such assurance, I will be constrained to support my leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that he vote with his leader, as I am sure he intended to do all along. The question he raises is an impossible one to answer. All of us understand the practicalities and realities of the situation confronting us. Were I in his place I would do the same thing. I know every one of my colleagues in the Senate understands the situation, and I hope the Senate can vote on the pending question very shortly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. One of the arguments used against the motion of the Senator from Illinois is that he proposes to disturb the sacred recommendations of the committee. I invite attention to the fact that the Senator who has raised that argument also disturbed the sacred recommendations of the committee earlier this afternoon when he offered an amendment to increase one of the items three times over the amount which the committee said was needed. By record votes the Senate has already increased the committee's recommendation by several million dollars. A million and a half dollars was added by one amendment, and $2 million by another and $4 million was added in another. I point out to my leader that the committee's recommendations are not always held sacred. It so happened that one of the changes made earlier this afternoon was offered by a a member of the committee itself.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; but the Senator from Delaware never appears at any Appropriations Committee hearing when we meet for hours, days, and weeks considering specific items, which is what we must do. I presume the members of the committee do not take their work lightly. We reduce the amounts on many items. We like to hear the views of other Senators. But it is a popular game, when the committee has finished, to criticize the committee on the floor of the Senate.

The committee did not agree with my proposal on access roads, so I said I would offer an amendment on the floor of the Senate. I served notice that I would do so, and today I spent considerable time talking about the problem and discussing it before the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In his whole legislative career, the distinguished Senator from Washington would not have sat as long and uninterruptedly in committee as the distinguished Senator from Delaware has sat in the hearing on the tax bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I would not have sat as long as that because it would not have taken me that much time to finish.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator from Wisconsin correctly understand that the Senator from Illinois intends to submit motions for the recommittal of all appropriation bills which exceed the recommendations of the House and the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will go further than that. My recommendation will be in the nature of a formula which I think will be fair.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that tomorrow the Senate will consider the Department of Defense appropriation bill, which I notice is $522 million above the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget and $589 million over the recommendation of the House. Does the Senator from Illinois intend to offer a motion for recommittal if the Senate goes along with the recommendation of the committee?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I contemplate voting against the bill. I shall do so for three reasons. First, it would finance the employment of 5,694 new employees who have been installed in the last 16 months. There has been no explanation or showing as to why those 5,694 new employees are needed .

Second, the bill as it is now before the Senate entails a 16-percent increase in the cost of operating the Department of the Interior.

Third, the bill provides for financing lead and zinc mines in the sum of $3,750 per man in lead, and $1,750 per man in zinc.

If all budgets were increased by 16 percent, where would the Treasury land? No explanation has been given of why $120 million more, according to the recommendation of the committee, is needed. The $120 million was increased by $6 million yesterday and today.

I shall voice my approval of the motion made by the Senator from Illinois, not by voting for his motion, but by voting against the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Washington, in view of the colloquy between him and the distinguished minority leader.

I have received an impression which concerns me very much. It is not my privilege to serve on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Iowa would be a good member.

Mr. MILLER. I am aware of the long hours spent by Senators who are members of that committee. I know the Senator from Washington speaks from knowledge when he talks about long hours. But somehow I get the impression that because of the numerous items in the appropriation bills and the long hours which are spent by the committee in the consideration of bills, there is a fatalistic outlook on cutting back appropriations in order to meet the revenue of the Federal Government.

Does the Senator from Washington see any possibility of the Committee on Appropriations recommending appropriations for the coming fiscal year in such a way as to match the expected revenue of the Federal Government, so that there will be a balanced budget?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think most appropriation bills provide less money than is requested by the Bureau of the Budget. I have handled many appropriation bills on the floor of the Senate. The amount provided by the bill now before the Senate is under the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget. The Budget makes its estimates based upon the estimated revenues. If revenues are not received in accordance with expectations, budgets become out of balance.

The point I make is that if a Senator who is deeply interested in a subject wishes to propose a reduction in or addition to the Budget request, or even discuss the subject with the committee, the committee will afford him a hearing. The committee welcomes Senators who are not members of the committee. Actually, they are heard first when they appear before a committee. We ask the representatives of other agencies to step aside in order that Senators may be accommodated first.

But when the committee works on a bill, if I agree with some parts of it, but disagree with other parts of it. I serve notice that I will propose an amendment on the floor of the Senate.

But if Senators do not appear before the committee and present their case, how can the committee know what is contemplated? Perhaps the case might be a good case.

The committee does not take fatalistic attitudes. But after we have gone over a bill with what we believe is a fine-toothed comb—and remember that the House also has considered the bill carefully—we then report to the Senate what we believe is a good bill.

Mr. MILLER. I am aware of the diligent work of the Committee on Appropriations, but is it the intent of the committee to match the appropriations in accordance with the revenue and with the President's promise of a balanced budget?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee receives the budget from the Bureau of the Budget, as the Senator from Iowa knows. The Bureau of the Budget submits its budget in accordance with the estimates of revenue. The committee does not have a barometer which can tell us daily whether the estimates of revenue will be up or down. I suppose that this year the revenue will be down a little. We do not have that information, but we do the best we can.

I do not believe the Committee on Appropriations has ever exceeded the budget, unless there was a pressing need to do so, or unless we honestly thought conditions warranted doing so.

I have handled 18 or 19 independent offices appropriation bills in the Senate. Each of them has provided $6 billion or $7 billion. Never have I reported a bill which was above the budget—and I think the Bureau of the Budget has some very serious-minded people.

Mr. MILLER. This is what I mean by fatalism: The attitude is that we shall never exceed the budget unless there is an urgent requirement to do so. But the fact is that for about 26 of the last 30 years the budget has been unbalanced.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator is incorrect. The Senate does not exceed the budget recommendations. Certainly, the budget has been unbalanced; but the reason why the budget has been unbalanced has been the stupid business called war. If it were not for the national defense, the Government could be operated on 19 cents of the tax dollar. That is what we are arguing about.

Mr. MILLER. I would be the first to agree that war or cold war is a serious problem with respect to balancing the budget. But the fact remains that the President of the United States promised the people a balanced budget.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Every President has promised that.

Mr. MILLER. Oh, no. The President of the United States did not promise a balanced budget last year. He promised one this year. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would the Senator like to know some of the fiscal facts of life concerning the budget?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know them as the Senator from Washington knows them. I am responding to the Senator's question.

I know this fiscal fact of life; namely, that the President has promised the American people a balanced budget. And I think we have a job on our hands if we are to deliver on that promise.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thought I had the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, Mr. President; I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I did not realize that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I have been listening to the colloquy between the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Washington. The Senator from Iowa has emphasized about half a dozen times that the President promised a balanced budget. I would discuss that for a moment.

In 1929, everyone took a balanced budget as a matter of course, at that time the national debt was less than 5 percent of what it is today.

A few minutes ago it was stated on the floor that if it had not been for the war, we never would have been in good shape. I challenge that statement. Some persons believe that war is needed in order to continue the profits of capitalism. I do not agree.

After all the things done by the Roosevelt administration between 1932 up to the beginning of World War II—and I did not approve of some of them—the national debt was less than $40 billion. Then the war in Europe began, and we decided to defend our country and did defend ourselves; and when the war was over, our national debt had risen from some $39 billion to some $270 billion. That is the record.

To me, it is clear the President cannot have a balanced budget in view of the recent stock market break, because anyone who has taken losses in the market—and I am among them—will pay less taxes; he will be able to offset his income with losses; and that will be true of hundreds of thousands of American taxpayers.

I agree with the Senator from Washington, having heard promises of balanced budgets ever since I first came to Washington, more than 40 years ago. No President—not President Hoover or President Eisenhower or President Truman or President Roosevelt could balance the budget following sharp economic breaks. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am prepared to vote on my motion, which is a very simple one.

Confucius observed that the longest journey begins with a single step. I am trying to take a single step in the field of economy; and I suggest that the Senate vote.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall be rather brief, Mr. President.

First, I do not wish to leave unchallenged the unique recital of economic history which has been given us by the Senator from Missouri, who wishes to

have the people of the country believe there cannot be a balanced budget because of the recent break in the stock market. If he examines the chronology of these matters, I believe he will discover that the unbalancing of the Federal budget preceded by many, many months the break in the stock market. So it cannot correctly be said that the break in the stock market is the reason why there will be an unbalanced budget. In any event, history will clearly disclose the facts, and no one can succeed in twisting the calendar of the past. It is perfectly clear that before the stock market started going down, our budget was woefully out of balance.

So, the question of whether the stock market break in part developed as a result of an unbalanced budget is one for the economists to answer—it could not have been the other way around. The timing is all wrong for that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The RECORD should show that the stock market began to go down in December. Recently, it went down more sharply.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator is speaking of the day-to-day drop, that is different from the recent big drop.

Mr. SYMINGTON. So I think the effect of the decline in the stock market applies definitely to the present calendar year, and also to the next fiscal year. Of course I do not say that the stock market drop constitutes the only factor to have an effect on the prospects for a balanced budget.

I think the Senator from South Dakota will agree, however, that the recent drop in the stock market may have the most to do with a possible balanced budget, from the standpoint of tax income versus Government outlay.

Mr. GOLDWATER and Mr. MILLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. I shall seek the floor later.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Missouri, let me say that I am sorry he thinks I am being a little unfair by emphasizing the President's promise of a balanced budget. But I am emphasizing it because I believe that if, due to the vicissitudes of the economy, the revenue which the President anticipated is not achieved, the very least we can do is not to cause additional expenditures. However, we have already caused additional expenditures to the extent of the additional $750 million for public works. So I am trying to point out that, at the least, we should not let the balanced budget become so greatly unbalanced as to cause discouragement among businessmen, because of further inflation.

The Senator knows that last year and in the first 4 months of this year we have had additional inflation which amounts to approximately $3.5 billion. We do not want that trend to continue.

I am sure the Senator from Missouri would like to see a balanced budget, if it is feasible. My point is that we should not make the situation any worse than it already is; and therefore, the Senator from Illinois is trying to have the Appropriations Committee review these bills, so that the effect on the unbalanced budget will not be more severe.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The other day I raised this question with Mr. Maurice Stans, an economist of some repute. I thought the decline in the stock market would have an effect on the revenue received by the General Treasury, but Mr. Stans warned me not to go out on such a limb; he warned me that the effect might be just the other way around. The effect might be the opposite of what I had thought.

So I do not think the decline in stock market prices necessarily means a sizable decline in revenue of the Federal Government. I offer this as a suggestion which I picked up from that able economist.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator; but I have not always agreed with Mr. Stans in the past, and cannot agree with him on this matter.

If thousands of taxpayers can take tax credits because of stock market losses, through sales of securities at the lower prices, I do not see how that would fail to have an adverse overall effect on income taxes reported by individuals and corporations throughout the country, because in addition to personal losses, I believe the able Senator from Arizona will agree the stock market break is bound to have an effect in the future on purchases—such items as automobiles, appliances, television sets, construction, and perhaps trips people plan to take.

I reply to the Senator from Iowa, I was not saying he was being unfair to the President. I know the Senator from Iowa would not be unfair. But my point is that he is emphasizing the President's balanced budget promise, which was made well before the sharp stock market break, and its reaction on our economy.

I am sure the Senator from Arizona does not believe that the only thing that kept the country going was war, because this country was in fine shape, with a relatively very small national debt, just before World War II.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is changing the subject. I did not offer this as my own conclusion. John Galbraith wrote, in 1952, in a book on economics, that this country was pulled out of the depression by World War II. Those were not my words; they were Mr. Galbraith's words—the words of one who, fortunately, has been for some time our Ambassador to India.

I think the Senator would do well to investigate the short-term gains and the profits and losses which have resulted from the recent decline in the stock market. I feel that the losses which were experienced will not be found to be as large as he has anticipated—certainly not of such a magnitude that they will add in a very considerable way to the deficit.

Automobile sales have reached an all-time peak, and may continue through the next quarter at that rate. It has not affected buying.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator continues to talk this way, I will begin to think the stock market break was a fine event.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the Senator is not going to pay taxes next year, perhaps it will be for him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have lost on the stock market break, and am sure the Senator from Arizona has, too.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, because the Senator from Arizona does not own a share of stock. I became smart in 1929.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have discovered how painful the subject of the economy really is, and I yield the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to make one further comment, in conclusion, so far as the stock market is concerned and its relationship to the budget. I think we are all disappointed that the stock market has been so steadily going down. If collectively we can dissuade our former colleague who is now in the White House from making any further ultimatums to business such as was inherent in the Yale University speech yesterday, perhaps we will suffer fewer of the serious slide-offs in the stock market such as is occurring today. As a body, we ought to work to restore the confidence of the business community, instead of slashing away at it with speeches from the White House or unwise legislation enacted by the Congress.

Turning now to the motion of the distinguished minority leader, I regret that I cannot support his motion to recommit. By and large, what I wanted to say on that subject has been ably said by the Senator from Oklahoma when he said this effort must be considered either a meat-ax approach or a departure from the appropriations procedures in the Senate by which we would capitulate completely to the House.

If we were to follow our distinguished minority leader in this instance and make this action a precedent, we might as well not make the time-consuming effort of having the extensive appropriations hearings which we hold on bills. The House does do a good job, but not a perfect job. Sometimes we reduce the amounts of the House appropriations; sometimes we increase them.

Frequently there are occurrences between the passage of the bill in the House and the time it gets to the Senate. Very often the Senate must act on requests for money which were not before the House.

I hope that our minority leader, after this effort tonight, will follow what he has indicated may be his future policy, and that is to propose a more effective, efficient, and successful method of bringing about economy by action in the Senate. With his fertile mind, I think, he

will be able to initiate efforts that will be fruitful, if he will devote his mind to leading attacks on line items in the bill as they come before us. I would not expect the Senator to come before the committee and take the case before the committee as the Senator from Washington proposed. It can be argued in public here on the Senate floor and handled through a series of rollcall votes.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and I made a couple of such efforts yesterday. We lost the big one, but the Senate did vote to economize to the extent of $100,000 in a rollcall vote. That is progress. It shows it can be done. We should try the same formula frequently. Economizing may become habit-forming if we all work at it hard.

I submit the example of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who always makes a line item fight on the foreign aid bill. He does not always win, but, with the tenacity of a bulldog, he continues his efforts until he gets figures to the point where the Senate adopts some of them. I think we need that kind of effort on all our appropriations bills, but I do not think it would be proper to vote to vacate everything we have done, to say that the word House is Holy Writ, and that we are not going to make any changes, but simply undo the long efforts we have made, when we can take the bills up item by item in committee.

I hope, as a result of the discussion on the Dirksen motion and the present effort of the minority leader, as we come to the next appropriation bill we will argue out the specific amendments and items, and perhaps we can repeat in many instances the success we had yesterday as we did, happily, on the cut of $100,000 on a line item in this bill.

I cannot go along with the minority leader on his meat-ax motion. I wanted to explain my position for the RECORD. I hope he will develop a more selective approach on other appropriation bills. I shall be happy to work with him in developing such an approach and delighted to support such an effective economy move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], to recommit the bill with instructions. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY] the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Virgina [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] is pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] would each vote "nay.'

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business, and his pair has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 89 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Beall	Dirksen	Pearson
Bennett	Fong	Prouty
Boggs	Goldwater	Proxmire
Bush	Hruska	Robertson
Butler	Javits	Scott
Capehart	Keating	Thurmond
Carlson	Miller	Wiley
Cooper	Morton	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Murphy	

NAYS—60

Allott	Hart	Morse
Anderson	Hartke	Moss
Bartlett	Hayden	Mundt
Bible	Hill	Muskie
Burdick	Humphrey	Neuberger
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pastore
Cannon	Jordan	Pell
Carroll	Kefauver	Randolph
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Russell
Church	Kuchel	Saltonstall
Clark	Lausche	Smathers
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Long, La.	Sparkman
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Ellender	Mansfield	Symington
Engle	McCarthy	Talmadge
Ervin	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Metcalf	Yarborough
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken	Fulbright	McClellan
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	McNamara
Case, N.J.	Hickey	Tower
Chavez	Holland	Young, N. Dak.
Cotton	Johnston	

So Mr. DIRKSEN's motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 10802) was read the third time.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I was compelled to vote against the motion to recommit, because I have heard many arguments which did not convince me that the way to economize is to come to the Senate Chamber and to make a gesture which in advance one knows will be futile. As a member of the Appropriations Committees for many years—for 12 years in the Senate and 4 years in the House—I think I know something about how to effect economies and curtail Federal spending.

Most members of the Committee on Appropriations desire to economize, although they are in disagreement on various items. In the Senate we do not hear many proposals to cut down on specific items of spending.

I shall not take much time, Mr. President. I merely call attention to one item as to which we could make a legitimate reduction which, in the long run, would result not only in economy but also in greater efficiency and real service for 350,000 Indians who live on reservations in this country.

In the current fiscal year there was an increase for the Bureau of Indian Affairs of $37 million over fiscal year 1961. However, in the pending bill there is a proposed increase of $39 million for fiscal year 1963 over the current fiscal year. This means that the budget for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and for the health program for the Indians in the next fiscal year will be approximately $265 million.

I have in my hand a tabulation which I had printed in the RECORD last year. I do not propose to have it printed at this time, but I merely call attention to the fact that 15 years ago, in 1948, the total budget for the Bureau of Indian Affairs was $39,806,000. The increase in the pending bill, for fiscal year 1963 over fiscal year 1962, is equal to that sum of $39 million. For a single year, after a very large increase in fiscal year 1962, there is a proposed $39 million increase for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which is a sum equal to the entire budget of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1948.

I call attention to this fact only because there are many opportunities, during the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee and in the Senate, as we consider the appropriation bills, to save many millions of dollars, if we have the will to economize and to stop unrestrained spending on the part of the executive departments downtown.

I hope that in the weeks and months ahead during this session we shall have the fortitude and courage, as well as the determination, to scrutinize bills in the Appropriations Committee and in the Senate. By so doing, we can curtail Federal spending and can make some real effort toward balancing the Federal budget.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I generally agree with the distinguished Senator. I have endeavored to be a proponent of economy. However, it is very difficult indeed, for me to vote against projects for the people of the United States when I know that similar projects are carried in foreign aid bills, or mutual assistance bills, as they are euphemistically called, for the people of other lands. That is one reason why I have not voted for all amendments to reduce amounts in all bills. It is very difficult to vote against a project in the United States when we know that the Congress will vote for similar projects for people in other lands.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his contribution. He has put his finger on a specific appropriation bill in which a reduction of probably 40 percent, 50 percent or 60 percent might be effected without minimizing in any way the effectiveness of our foreign aid program. That is a good illustration of real economy.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR UTAH

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise in support of six important appropriation items which the Senate Appropriations Committee has approved but which were neither in the President's budget nor in the House-passed bill. The Senate committee and its chairman are to be commended for including these items in the bill because of their great importance. These items are as follows:

First, $50,000 to initiate a survey of a scenic parkway in southern Utah.

Second, $105,000 to reconstruct and improve the access road to the Bear River National Wildlife Refuge, connecting it with Brigham City, Utah.

Third, $20,000 to commence a 3-year program to acquire vitally needed private lands to assure the success of the American Fork watershed project.

Fourth, $150,000 to construct a visitors center at Natural Bridges National Monument in San Juan County, Utah.

Fifth, $450,000 to start construction of a $900,000 Forest Service watershed research laboratory at Logan, Utah.

Sixth, $25,000 to continue and expand the technical assistance program on fisheries for the Colorado River storage project at Springville, Utah.

SOUTHERN UTAH NATIONAL PARKWAY

For over a year I have waged a campaign in behalf of construction of a national scenic parkway to be built across southern Utah, designed to connect the national parks and monuments in southwestern Utah and in adjacent northern Arizona and western Nevada with the national monuments and recreation area in southeastern Utah and western Colorado.

The first step in this campaign was introduction of a bill, S. 808, to authorize construction of the proposed Southern Utah National Parkway. However, this was opposed by Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall on the ground that a preliminary survey should be made. Therefore, I introduced a bill, S. 2280, which would authorize $80,000 to make such a survey. But in reporting on this second bill, the Department of Interior said, concerning the undertaking of the survey, "We hope to do this when personnel and funds are available for the purpose." However, the Department gave no indication that either personnel or funds would be available in the foreseeable future. On February 28, I, therefore, addressed a letter to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, asking that the committee interrogate National Park Service officials determining whether or not the Service could undertake a survey on the proposed parkway if funds were made available.

Then on March 6 of this year, I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of a $80,000 appropriations to survey the parkway. That same day, the senior Senator from Arizona incorporated my bill, S. 2280, in the hearing record and asked the Director of the National Park Service, Conrad Wirth, how much money could be used economically to undertake the survey called for by the bill. Mr. Wirth said that he would study the matter, and subsequently submitted a statement for the hearings record in which he said:

> The feasibility study contemplated in S. 2280 could be completed in 1 fiscal year. Accordingly, the National Park Service could economically use the full amount of $80,000 which the survey is estimated to cost in the 1963 fiscal year.

Mr. Wirth then proposed to broaden the study over a 2-year period at a cost of about $160,000. I ask unanimous consent that those portions of pages 677 and 678 of the committee hearings that apply to the proposed parkway be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the portions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH PARKWAY REQUEST

Mr. WIRTH. That is the parkway, yes.

Chairman HAYDEN. The proposed Southern Utah National Parkway. Does the amount which you request for the national park system plans include this survey?

Mr. WIRTH. No; it does not.

Chairman HAYDEN. How much could you economically use for this purpose?

Mr. WIRTH. I would like to check on that and make a recommendation or submit some material, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman HAYDEN. You may place it in the record.

Mr. WIRTH. All right. That is rugged country down in southern Utah, and while there is a lot of it that we could get through, I think I would like to make a little closer analysis of how much would be needed for that.

(The information referred to follows:)

"AMOUNT THAT COULD BE USED ECONOMICALLY IN 1963 IN CARRYING OUT THE SURVEY CONTEMPLATED IN S. 2280

"The feasibility study contemplated in S. 2280 could be completed in 1 fiscal year. Accordingly, the National Park Service could economically use the full amount of $80,000 which the survey is estimated to cost in the 1963 fiscal year. The Service feels, however, that such a study should include not only southern Utah but the general Colorado River region in adjoining States where outstanding scenic parkway possibilities exist. This would include the area covered by S. 2280 and areas in southeastern Nevada, western Colorado, northwestern New Mexico, and northern Arizona. Such an overall study would require 2 years and would cost about $160,000."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is clear from the record that the $50,000 included in the Senate appropriations bill is a result of my work and my efforts both in introducing S. 2280 and in appearing before the committee for funds. Therefore, it is equally clear that the $50,000 this year will be used principally to survey the possible routes proposed in S. 280. Such a parkway would be a veritable national park in its own right, opening up one of the most magnificent scenic areas in the United States. Moreover, it would bring more tourists to that area of the Southwestern United States than any combination of new national parks that I can think of. My parkway proposal is endorsed by virtually every responsible organization in southern Utah, as well as State officials.

Unfortunately, there is not a single national parkway west of the Mississippi River, and virtually all of the parkways are in the South. Yet, it is we in the West who are expected to give up hundreds of thousands and even millions of acres of land for national park purposes. Therefore, I think it is high time that this discrimination against the West be ended. National parkways should be scenic routes connecting national parks, and I think that we in the West are entitled to consideration.

ACCESS ROAD TO BEAR RIVER NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

Mr. President, I also wish to give my full support to amendment D of May 14, offered by the senior Senator From Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], which makes possible reconstruction and improvement of the 14-mile access road to the Bear River National Wildlife Refuge west of Brigham City, Utah.

The road is about 14 miles in length, extending from just west of Brigham City to the refuge headquarters. Both the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the Box Elder County Commission have surveyed the road and report that 11½ miles is in poor condition and in need of repairs. Some sections are in extremely bad condition and in some places are hardly passable.

The Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, D. H. Janzen, indicated to me in a letter of February 20 that the Bureau feels a "moral responsibility" to cooperate with county officials "to whatever extent possible." However, there were no funds included in the President's fiscal year 1963 budget requests.

No doubt, Director Janzen's statement that the Bureau has a moral responsibility to assist in building the road is based upon the fact that the road is the sole access to the refuge, and the great bulk of its use comes from Government employees and others using the refuge. Ap-

proximately 22,000 people visited the refuge last last year. This high degree of use has resulted in the present serious condition of the road.

At the present time, Box Elder County realizes only about $100 in taxes from this vast 64,000-acre area which has almost totally been removed from the county property tax rolls.

Federal participation in this kind of a road program for national refuges has recent precedents. The Okefenokee Refuge in Georgia presents an almost direct parallel to the Bear River Refuge road situation. There, Congress appropriated funds to rebuild the road in fiscal years 1957 and 1958. The work was placed up for bid by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife according to specifications prescribed by local county officials. Shortly thereafter, Congress approved a similar cooperative road program at the White River, Ark., Refuge. In this case, a fire protection road was built around the refuge, using existing roads as much as possible.

Box Elder County is not in a position to build a road because its funds are already committed elsewhere to roads which serve residents of the county and which have a higher priority than the Bear River Refuge access road, which is essentially a service road for the refuge. The available Federal aid secondary funds have been budgeted by the county over the next 3 years for a road north of Great Salt Lake leading to Nevada. The county's problem has been made even worse by the recent floods throughout the county with consequent need to repair county roads and bridges.

Although the county does not have funds to rebuild the road, it is willing to cooperate fully and will furnish county labor and equipment to rebuild the road. It is also willing to maintain the road in the future just as it has in the past.

This is a most worthwhile cooperative project, and I urge the Senate to approve the amendment which would permit Federal participation to the extent of $105,000.

LANDS FOR AMERICAN FORK WATERSHED PROJECT

Some time ago, Congress approved the American Fork watershed project to carry out vitally needed conservation activities as a joint endeavor by the local people and by the Forest Service and Soil Conservation Service. However, a problem has arisen because some of the land most needed is privately owned and surrounded by National Forest Service lands in the upper reaches of the watershed. There are about 30 private landowners involved. The Utah County Commission, the local participating organizations, and the Forest Service have all advised me that there cannot be a gap of untreated lands in the upper watershed arca, or the entire project may be doomed to failure.

The Forest Service has developed a detailed 3-year program, which will cost $80,000. With this money, the land will be purchased from the 30 private owners, attached to the national forest, and conservation work undertaken thereon. The Forest Service advised me that it can use $20,000 during the coming fiscal year, and the Appropriations Committee approved that amount. It will be financed from Uinta National Forest receipts. Unfortunately, there is no authority under Public Law 566, which was passed by Congress in 1954, to carry out watershed treatment work.

This is one of the most important watersheds in Utah and must be protected. A small investment now will reap untold benefits in the future.

VISITORS' CENTER AT NATURAL BRIDGES NATIONAL MONUMENT

For over half a century the Natural Bridges National Monument has been in existence without any significant development being undertaken by the National Park Service. For many months I have waged a campaign to correct this record of neglect, and effort which has finally borne fruits. This year the budget requests include over $433,000 to build an access road, parking lot, two employee residences and utilities at Natural Bridges. Unfortunately, the President's budget did not include funds for a vitally needed visitors' center; so it was necessary for me to appear before the Senate Appropriations Committee in support of $150,000 for this purpose. The committee deserves commendation for including this worthy project in the bill, and I approve Senate approval.

FOREST SERVICE WATERSHED RESEARCH LABORATORY

One of the great programs under the administration of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson was the program for the national forests. It was based upon careful study, and estimated the work needed and the costs involved to fully develop our forest resources. One of the key features in this program was a major Forest Service watershed, erosion and rehabilitation research laboratory, to be built at Logan, Utah, in cooperation with the Utah State University. Utah State University has one of the most outstanding corps of water experts in the United States.

The laboratory would cost $900,000, but unfortunately was not included in the President's budget for the coming fiscal year. The project is one of nine forest research projects included in the program so well presented by Senator STENNIS in a speech given to the Senate on February 15, 1962.

The purpose of the laboratory is to study problems relating to flash floods originating on steep mountain watersheds. It is expected that the laboratory will be able to develop ways of improving water yield from the mountain watershed, and ways of rehabilitating areas which are producing excessive runoff and erosion.

Plant cover is the only effective natural means of protecting against the high-intensity rainstorms which strike high mountain areas, yet because of the rapid runoff it is very difficult to establish vegetation by usual means. It is believed that this laboratory could develop new techniques and acquire new information about mountain erosion and the effects of vegetation on floods, which could greatly cut down losses both from erosion and from flooding.

The laboratory facility will conduct research on problems covering a large area in Utah, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and western Wyoming.

This is a vitally needed project and I urge Senate approval of the $450,000 which the committee has included in the bill.

COLORADO PROJECT TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ON FISHERIES

Unfortunately, funds were not included in the budget to continue and expand the technical assistance program on fisheries for the Colorado River storage project at Springville, Utah.

This is a cooperative program with the Utah Fish and Game Commission to develop the sport fishing possibilities in connection with the project and to provide for technical assistance to the Skull Valley and Uintah-Ouray Indian Reservations. There is a great need for this project and I urge the Senate to approve $25,000 for this purpose in support of the committee action already taken.

CONCLUSION

My remarks have been directed only to those items which have not already been approved by the House, but in addition I fully support the $2,673,355 program for development of national parks and monuments in Utah. As one of the stanch supporters of the 10-year Mission 66 program to bring these areas up to a suitable standard, I am pleased to see the great progress which has been made in Utah.

In addition, to other Interior appropriation items which have my general support, I specifically endorse the $408,000 for the Fish Springs National Wildlife Refuge, $80,000 for the Springville fish hatchery and $30,000 for the cooperative fishery unit at Utah State University, $55,000 for the Ouray National Wildlife Refuge, and the $90,000 for the Bear River National Wildlife Refuge.

PARK HEADQUARTERS REGION

Mr. McGEE subsequently said: Mr. President, an item is contained in the appropriation bill just passed by the Senate on which I should like to comment, in view of matters which are already included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The language in the report of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations includes a proposal by the Secretary of the Interior to move the region 2 to park headquarters, Cheyenne, Wyo. The proposal was made at the instigation of the Department alone sometime last winter, and not upon the instigation of Senators from the State of Wyoming at that time. The reason for the proposed move, according to the Department of the Interior, was that of economy. It was thought that the movement of the office to Cheyenne, Wyo., would be in the interest of saving the taxpayers' money. However, on the House side protests were lodged against the proposed move. The protests were mobilized by Members of the House from both Nebraska and Iowa, and understandably so, inasmuch as the proposal involved

the city of Omaha and approximately 100 families.

As a result of the protests on the House side, the suggestion was made by the Secretary of the Interior, under interrogation, that he would be glad to have another look at the proposal, to reexamine all the data at stake, and make a new determination as to whether it would be economical to move the office to Cheyenne. That promise and that commitment having been made, the House committee nonetheless included language in its report that would prohibit the use of any funds by the Department to transfer the office from Omaha to Cheyenne. With that in mind, I think we ought to keep the record straight before this body because of the House action.

My colleague [Mr. HICKEY] offered an amendment on the floor of the Senate to strike the House language. The point of the Hickey amendment was to remove any restrictions or restraints upon the Department if in its judgment it found it of interest to the taxpayers and the saving of money to make that shift of the park headquarters. As a consequence of the Hickey amendment, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate accepted the modification and suggested language of its own. The language which the committee of the Senate introduced in its report was that—

The committee feels that the National Park Service should not be denied the use of funds contained in this bill to transfer its region II headquarters from Omaha, Nebr., to Cheyenne, Wyo., if after the Secretary of the Interior's promised restudy is completed, the advisability of the transfer is confirmed.

In the light of that language, I think the RECORD should further show that the basis for the proposal of the shift from Omaha is not new or unique with this session of Congress. For whatever reasons, twice in recent years the proposal has been made to transfer the office farther west. The basis of the economic determination of the cost of administering the office or the cost of the move, I think, are rather open to question, depending upon what factors are used for calculating the ultimate cost figure. I think the offer of the Secretary of the Interior was made in good faith in an attempt to make an honest cost calculation before such a move was undertaken, but I think it well to point out to Senators that the reason for the economy at stake lay in the long-range advantages that Secretary of the Interior Udall expressed in his testimony before the House committee when he was being interrogated on the basis of the move. One might raise the question at this point, What has happened since the earlier two attempts to move the office away from Omaha to a point farther west? What has happened to change the earlier calculations? Whatever other factors may have been involved in the administrative decision to make the shift, I can suggest one basic and fundamental change that has taken place, and that is that the load administered until now by the region 2 office in Omaha has been substantially shifted. The President's new Outdoor Recreation Commission has now been set up and prepared to take on much of the administrative detail for the State parks and any municipalities that once were lodged with the Park Service itself.

It is understandable on the part of some that under the old jurisdiction of the Park Service in region 2, which stretched all the way from Missouri and the Dakotas to the Rocky Mountain States, as far west as Utah, there was a case to be made for the geographical location, but only the geographical location, of the office in that area. With the larger portion of these duties which are being administered in Missouri and Nebraska and Iowa and Dakotas now being shifted to the Outdoor Recreation Commission, it seems to me that it makes only more understandable the position of the Park Service that this office should be shifted to a point more centrally located in the particular areas of concern to the Park Service. Four major national parks lie in the center of the area in which Cheyenne would be the vortex, namely, the Rocky Mountain National Park, the Grand Teton National Park, Yellowstone, and Glacier.

The point of the Interior Department is that for two reasons this would be a fundamental economy. First, it would be administratively less costly, that it would be close logistically to the point of operations which for other reasons center at the present time at San Francisco; and that in general the move to Cheyenne, Wyo., would be in the interest of tighter operation and more economical operation.

I say all this by way of background, because I believe it is well to keep the whole problem in perspective.

We are mindful of the difficulty that this move poses to roughly a hundred families which would under this proposal be moved from Omaha. It is understandable that there are those who would not like to leave Omaha. Most of us hesitate to disrupt families.

I think it ought to be the objective judgment of this body that the convenience of officials or families in an administrative setup of our Government ought to be one of lesser priority to the efficiency and the economy of the operation of such an office. In my judgment anyone who goes into Federal service, including the Park Service, must accept the occupational hazard that he will be moved about here and there from time to time. He has no guarantees and cannot have any guarantee of perpetual longevity in any given community merely because he likes it in that community. I have news for those who may be so involved. They will experience a delightful and exhilarating experience in being moved to their new location. I say that, remembering my own delight in living in Nebraska.

However, I believe that this should have nothing to do with the basic determination of the location of a regional office. It is for that reason that I urge every Member of the Senate conferees to take a strong position on retaining the Senate language. We do not say in the Senate language that the Park Service office must be moved anywhere. We do not say that it must be moved to Cheyenne, or must stay in Omaha. We only say that, in all fairness, when the Secretary has promised to reexamine the subject, we do not wish to prejudge the judgment administratively on this score. It is on that basis that we would prefer to leave the question of the Park Service location up to the Secretary of the Interior at the present time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 10802) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him, relating to the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies appropriation bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HICKEY

The Interior and related agencies appropriations bill for 1963, having been passed by the Senate, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues certain language adopted by the Senate Appropriations Committee and included in its report to the Senate.

The background of the committee's statement is as follows:

Some months ago the Interior Department announced that the National Park Service would transfer its Region II headquarters from Omaha to Cheyenne, Wyo. The reasons for this move were increased efficiency and economy, as the Wyoming city is more conveniently located in relation to the national parks. Subsequently the Department announced that it would restudy the issue. Then, when the Interior and related agencies bill was before the House Appropriations Committee, that unit included in its report a restriction forbidding any of the appropriated funds to be used for the office transfer.

When the bill was before the Senate committee, I proposed the following language which Senator MCGEE, a member of the committee, accepted and which the Senate committee included in its report:

"The committee feels that the National Park Service should not be denied the use of funds contained in this bill to transfer its Region II headquarters from Omaha, Nebr., to Cheyenne, Wyo., if after the Secretary of the Interior's promised restudy is completed, the advisability of the transfer is confirmed."

I quote this section of the committee report at this point, so that the RECORD may clearly show the intent of the Senate in regard to this matter.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued July 27, 1962
For actions of July 26, 1962
87th-2d, No. 128

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....11
Appropriations..1,10,17,23
Communications.....7
Consumers.....20
Cotton.....24
Dairy industry.....14
Disaster relief.....13,25
Farm program.....12
Food and drugs.....18
Foreign trade.....15
Forest Service.....1
Forestry.....3,19
Health.....4
Housing.....5
Land-grant colleges.....16
Lands.....8
Loans.....5,6,25
Legislative program.....10
Lumber industry.....19
Personnel.....4
Price supports.....14
Property.....21
Public assistance.....22
Reclamation.....2,10
Research.....3,8
Small business.....25
Social security.....22
Transportation.....9

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed appropriation continuation measure. House subcommittee voted to report bill to aid States in forestry research. House committee voted to report bill for housing for elderly in rural areas.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 839 the appropriations continuation resolution to make temporary appropriations until August 31, 1962, for those departments and agencies, including this Department, whose annual appropriation bills have not yet been enacted. p. 13842

Conferees were appointed on H. R. 10802, the Department of Interior and related agencies (including Forest Service) appropriation bill, 1963. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 13842

Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 11289, the appropriation bill, 1963. pp. 13852-62

The Appropriations Committee was granted until midnight Fri. to report the independent offices appropriation bill for 1963. p. 13842

2. RECLAMATION. Passed with amendment S. 405, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho (pp. 13849-50). Earlier, by a vote of 199 to 162, passed a similar House bill, H. R. 529, which was later tabled. pp. 13842-3, 13844-50

3. FORESTRY. The Subcommittee on Forests of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 12688, to encourage and assist the several States in carrying on a program of forestry research. p.D641

4. PERSONNEL. The Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 10539, to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act to provide additional choice of health plans. p. D642

5. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 12628, to authorize a program of housing for the elderly in rural areas. p. D641

6. LOANS. The Banking and Currency Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3327, to make certain federally impacted areas eligible for assistance under the public facility loan program. p. D641

7. COMMUNICATIONS. The Subcommittee on Government Activities of the Government Operations Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 11899, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for a Federal telecommunications fund. p. D642

8. LANDS. The Subcommittee on Government Activities of the Government Operations Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 10134, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land at the Agricultural Research Center in Prince Georges County, Md., to the American National Red Cross. p. D642

9. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 1341, to require passenger carrying motor vehicles purchased for use by the Federal Government to meet certain safety standards. p. D642

10. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that the following bills will be considered on Mon. and Tues.: independent offices appropriation bill for 1963; H. R. 575, Baker Federal reclamation project; and S. 2008, Spokane Valley reclamation project. p. 13862

11. ADJOURNED until Mon., July 30. p. 13876

SENATE

No items of interest to this Department.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

12. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Poage criticizing the report of the Committee for Economic Development relating to agriculture and inserting a letter of the vice president of the Nebr. Feed Grain Growers Assoc. critical of the report. pp. A5782-3

13. DISASTER RELIEF. Extension of remarks of Rep. Wharton urging additional aid for drought stricken areas in upstate N. Y. and inserting an editorial, "Cows Can't Eat Redtape." p. A5774

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 108 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 26, 1962 No. 128

House of Representatives

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 14: 1: *Let not your heart be troubled; ye believe in God, believe also in me.*

Almighty God, as we enter upon the business of a new day, inspire us to realize that we are workers with Thee in the building of a better world, each to the extent of his ability and all with equal fidelity.

Grant that in these troubled times we may never surrender to that illogical reasoning and impulsive judgment that Thou art not great enough to prevent such days and not good enough to care.

God forbid that we should ever have any doubt and misgiving as to Thy greatness and goodness or allow our faith in Thy gracious providence to become cold and cynical.

We beseech Thee to purge us of all fear as we encounter stern duties and heavy responsibilities, and may we walk with soul erect, untroubled and unafraid.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2129. An act for the relief of John Calvin Taylor;

H.R. 2664. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irena Ratajczak;

H.R. 3000. An act for the relief of Lea Min Wong;

H.R. 3501. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hasmik Arzoo;

H.R. 3821. An act for the relief of Ivy Gwendolyn Myers;

H.R. 4718. An act for the relief of Bogdan Kusulja;

H.R. 6833. An act for the relief of Frantisek Tisler;

H.R. 8214. An act to permit the use of certain construction tools actuated by explosive charges in construction activity on the U.S. Capitol Grounds;

H.R. 9186. An act for the relief of Eladio Aris (also known as Eladio Aris Carvallo);

H.R. 9520. An act to continue for 2 years the suspension of duty on certain alumina and bauxite;

H.R. 9522. An act for the relief of certain members of the U.S. Marine Corps who incurred losses pursuant to the cancellation of a permanent change of station movement;

H.R. 10184. An act to amend section 130(a) of title 28, United States Code, so as to reconstitute the eastern judicial district of Wisconsin to include Menominee County, Wis.;

H.R. 10525. An act for the relief of Francis L. Quinn;

H.R. 10786. An act to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11127. An act for the relief of Ernst Haeusserman;

H.R. 11785. An act authorizing the change in name of the Beardstown, Ill., flood control project, to the Sid Simpson flood control project; and

H.J. Res. 417. Joint resolution to designate the lake formed by Terminus Dam on the Kaweah River in California as Lake Kaweah.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7431. An act to provide for the free entry of certain stained glass for St. Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, Conn., and for the Church of St. Francis Xavier of Phoenix, Ariz.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1781. An act for the relief of the heirs of Lt. Col. James Murray Bate (deceased) and Maj. Billie Harold Lynch (deceased);

S. 2546. An act to authorize the naming of the Old River, La., structures in honor of the late Capt. A. A. Humphreys and Lt. H. L. Abbott;

S. 2660. An act to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Clark Canyon Dam in the State of Montana as Hap Hawkins Lake;

S. 2988. An act to change the name of the Big Bend Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Sharpe;

S. 3066. An act to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future flood disasters;

S. 3198. An act for the relief of Renata Lattanzi;

S. 3215. An act for the relief of Kim Chong Koo;

S. 3228. An act for the relief of Panagiota Makris;

S. 3295. An act for the relief of Mathew Lengyel (also known as Brother Paul, S.V.D.);

S. 3441. An act to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building;

S. 3476. An act to change the name of Fort Randall Reservoir in the State of South Dakota to Lake Francis Case;

S.J. Res. 169. Joint resolution designating the bridge across the Tennessee River on the Natchez Trace Parkway as the John Coffee Memorial Bridge; and

S. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1074. An act for the relief of Chao Yao Koh;

S. 1889. An act for the relief of Mrs. Geohar Ogassian; and

S. 2339. An act for the relief of George Ross Hutchins.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 to the bill of the House (H.R. 8141) entitled "An act to revise the laws relating to depository libraries."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution as follows:

S. RES. 366

Resolved, That the legislative business of the Senate be now suspended in order that memorial addresses may be delivered on the life, character, and public service of Honorable Francis Case, late a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, do adjourn.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KIRWAN, MAGNUSON, CANNON, JENSEN, and TABER.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Friday to file a conference report on the bill H.R. 10802.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL—1963

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the independent offices appropriation bill for 1963.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, on that I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have permission to sit today during general debate in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 177]

Alford	Frazier	Peterson
Arends	Garland	Pilcher
Baring	Gray	Powell
Bass, N.H.	Gubser	Purcell
Battin	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Colo.
Blitch	Healey	Rogers, Tex.
Boggs	Hébert	St. Germain
Bolton	Hoffman, Mich	Saund
Bonner	Holifield	Scherer
Boykin	Keith	Scranton
Bromwell	Kilburn	Shelley
Buckley	King, Utah	Sheppard
Carey	Loser	Smith, Miss.
Celler	McFall	Spence
Coad	McSween	Stafford
Cramer	McVey	Taber
Curtis, Mass.	May	Teague, Calif.
Davis, Tenn.	Merrow	Thompson, La.
Dawson	Michel	Willis
Durno	Morrison	Winstead
Fallbstein	Moulder	Wright
Flood	Nelsen	Zelenko
Flynt	Norblad	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations and under leave previously granted, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 839) making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1963, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That clause (c) of section 102 of the joint resolution of July 1, 1962 (Public Law 87-513), is hereby amended by striking out "July 31, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "August 31, 1962".

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is identical with the continuing resolution now in effect—with the exception of the date of expiration. It merely extends the time 1 month.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr GROSS. The gentleman does not anticipate that we will be confronted with another extension to September 30, does he?

Mr. CANNON. We are making rapid progress with the money bills, and we expect to have transmitted all of them to the White House before the date provided by this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not anticipate that we will have to extend this time to September 30, does he?

Mr. CANNON. I trust not.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF ENROLLED BILL

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. Con. Res. 506) to correct an error in the enrollment of H.R. 10786, the so-called Work Hours Act of 1962, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 10786) to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the United States, for any territory, or for the District of Columbia; and for other purposes, is authorized and directed to make the following change, viz: On page 11, line 3, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "June 18, 1912" and insert "June 19, 1912".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANN CREEK FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 729 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 529) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 729 makes in order the consideration of H.R. 529, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and

July 27, 1962 No. 129

"Title III (Subtitle B)---Wheat Program"

"A marketing certificate plan under which noncertificated wheat would be supported at a level determined after consideration of its feed value and world price, and certificated wheat would be supported at between 65 and 90 percent of parity. Certificates would be issued to producers for all wheat consumed domestically for food and such part of the exports as determined by the Secretary would carry out the price and income objectives of the bill.

"Title IV---Credit"

"1. Farmers Home Administration loans for recreational facilities and sewers.

"2. An increase (from $10 million to $25 million) in the amount of direct FHA real estate loans for immediate resale which can be made from the agricultural credit insurance fund.

"3. A single loan fund for Rural Electrification Administration loans, to include funds appropriated, borrowed, or repaid, and to be available for loans only as authorized in appropriation acts.

"Title V---Industrial Uses of Agricultural Products"

"Establishes an Agricultural Research and Industrial Use Administration within the Department of Agriculture to coordinate and expedite an expanded research program on industrial uses of agricultural commodities."

HOUSE

12. FORESTRY. The agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 12688 (amended), to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the States in carrying on a program of forestry research; H. R. 9728, to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act to increase the appropriation authorization from $2.5 million to $5 million; S. 3064 (amended), to increase the authorization for the national survey of forest resources; S. 3112 (amended), to add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colo. and the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests in N. M.; and H. R. 7195 (amended), to add certain lands to the Wasatch National Forest, Utah. The Subcommittee on Forests of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 11111, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey certain forest lands in Iowa. p. D646

13. EXTENSION WORK; RESEARCH. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 12589, to amend the Smith-Lever Act so as to revise the formula for apportioning funds among the States, and H. R. 12568 (a clean bill to be introduced), to assist States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations. p. D646

14. APPROPRIATIONS. Received (during adjournment of the House) the conference report on H. R. 10802, the Department of Interior and related agencies, including Forest Service, appropriation bill for 1963 (H. Rept. 2049) (pp. 13968-70). At the end of this Digest is a table showing the action of the conferees on Forest Service items.

The Appropriations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) the independent offices appropriation bill for 1963. p. D647

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

15. PERSONNEL. Extension of remarks of Sen. Mundt criticizing the increase in the number of Federal employees, and inserting an article, "The Federal Diary--New Policy Aims at More Output Per U. S. Employee." p. A5796

16. BUDGETING. Extension of remarks of Sen. Byrd inserting a resolution by the Virginia Bankers Association urging a reduction of Federal expenditures. p.A5797

17. RECLAMATION. Speech in the House of Rep. Aspinall supporting the Mann Creek Federal Reclamation Project, Idaho. p. A5802

Speech in the House of Rep. Saylor opposing the Mann Creek Federal Reclamation Project, Idaho. pp. A5804-5

BILLS INTRODUCED

18. WHEAT. S. 3574 by Sen. Ellender (by request), to extend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

19. WATER RESOURCES. S. 3579, by Sen. Anderson, to establish water resources research institutes at land-grant colleges and State universities, and to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Remarks of author, pp. 13961-5

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS JULY 30:
Marketing orders for potatoes, H. Agriculture (Hedlund, AMS, to testify).
Wilderness preservation bill, H. Interior (exec).
Foreign trade bill, S. Finance.
Indirect costs in research grants, H. Science and Astronautics.
Federal pay bill, S. Civil Service.
Foreign aid appropriations, H. Appropriations (exec).
Travel by Government employees on U. S. air carriers, S. Commerce.

oOo

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Conference Report, 1963

Item	Appropriations, 1962	Budget Estimates, 1963	House Bill, 1963	Senate Bill, 1963	Conference Report, 1963
ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS:					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management a/	b/ $127,641,000	$140,740,000	$138,400,000	$141,045,000	$139,400,000
Forest research	26,368,000	23,150,000	22,975,000	25,865,000	24,835,000
State and private forestry cooperation	15,800,000	15,800,000	15,800,000	16,405,000	15,830,000
Total, Forest protection and utilization	169,809,000	179,690,000	177,175,000	183,315,000	180,065,000
Forest roads and trails	35,000,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000
Access roads	2,000,000	2,000,000	- -	6,000,000	2,000,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Superior National Forest	250,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Special Acts:					
Cache National Forest	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
Uinta and Wasatch National Forests	- -	- -	- -	20,000	20,000
Cooperative range improvements	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	1,000,000
Total, Annual Appropriations	208,769,000	222,900,000	218,385,000	231,045,000	223,295,000
PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS (Primarily "Payments to States and Territories" and "Roads and Trails for States" payable from national forest receipts) c/	44,928,500	50,479,300	50,479,300	50,479,300	50,479,300

a/ Includes contingency funds to the extent necessary as follows: (1) For emergency forest fire fighting, $5,000,000; and (2) for insect and disease control, $1,910,000.

b/ In addition $34,500,000 provided in Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for fighting forest fires.

c/ In addition, prior year balances available.

87TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 2049

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

JULY 27, 1962.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. KIRWAN, from the committee of conference, submitted the the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 10802]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 18, 20, 22, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, and 42.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 24, 29, 41, 44, and 46, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$41,510,200*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$81,300,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$53,775,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$25,525,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$8,622,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$40,775,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: *$26,675,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$15,225,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$27,112,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$6,922,300*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,675,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$139,400,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$500,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$24,835,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$15,830,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert *$2,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert *sixty-five*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$55,834,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$3,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9:

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Public Land Management

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $41,510,200 for management of lands and resources instead of $39,375,000 as proposed by the House and $43,022,200 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase provided over the House bill reflects a decrease of $129,800 in funds for information and publications personnel and increases as follows: $2,000,000 for rehabilitation of range lands; and $265,000 for cadastral surveys.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $81,300,000 for education and welfare services instead of $81,000,000 as proposed by the House and $82,827,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for expenses of educating Indian children in Federal facilities.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $34,300,000 for resources management as proposed by the House instead of $34,677,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes $70,000 for maintenance of roads on the Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $53,775,000 for construction instead of $52,000,000 as proposed by the House and $55,550,000 as proposed by the Senate. It is expected that the Agency will undertake with the amount provided construction of the complete budgeted program including the Chilocco shop building, the Wahpeton dormitories, and the Phoenix classroom building, and the Laguna Consolidated School, New Mexico. The conferees believe that through the exercise of stricter controls the Agency should be able to achieve greater economies in planning and construction costs than anticipated in the estimates.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $16,000,000 for road construction (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the House instead of $17,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are

in agreement that the Department should provide for the full authorized program for regular Indian roads. In addition, the amount approved includes $230,000 for completion of grading and base course required for the Toreva-Winslow Road, Arizona.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $4,000,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the House instead of $4,350,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount, together with the transfer of not to exceed $2,900,000 from program funds, will provide a total of $6,900,000.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Provide for the purchase of not to exceed 220 passenger motor vehicles, including 50 for police type use, as proposed by the House instead of 230, including 71 for police type use, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in disagreement.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $25,525,000 for management and protection instead of $25,425,000 as proposed by the House and $26,034,320 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for additional U.S. Park Police. The conferees direct that not less than $1,101,096 of the amount provided shall be transferred to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, representing the amounts programed under this item for fiscal year 1962 for "Nationwide recreation planning" ($504,337) and "Cooperation with States and other agencies" ($596,759).

Amendment No. 11: Provides limitation of $8,622,000 on the amount of funds available for acquisition of lands instead of $8,409,000 as provided by the House and $11,635,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $213,000 in the House bill limitation is for acquisition of 133 acres of the Henry Claggett tract at Mockley Point on the Potomac River shore opposite Mount Vernon.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $40,775,500 for construction instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $44,526,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $213,000 for acquiring the Mockley Point tract opposite Mount Vernon as indicated above; $172,500 for restoration of the Appomattox Court House; $240,000 for construction of a visitor center at Kennesaw Mountain National Historical Park; and $150,000 for stabilizing the banks of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal outside the areas of possible inundation under the water resources projects proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

Amendment No. 13: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree that no part of the $213,200 provided under the item "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)" for resurfacing the Chesapeake and Ohio tow path shall be expended in any areas of possible inundation under the water resources projects proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $1,964,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,900,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is to provide full funding for the 40 existing positions which are to be transferred to this item from the construction appropriation.

Amendments No. 15 and 16: Provide for the purchase of not to exceed 152 passenger motor vehicles, including 57 for police type use,

as proposed by the Senate instead of 135, including 50 for police type use, as proposed by the House.

Mineral Resources

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment No. 17: Deletes language inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $56,100,000 for surveys, investigations, and research as proposed by the House instead of $56,900,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree that no action should be taken by the Department to establish an Institute of Water Research.

BUREAU OF MINES

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $26,675,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of $26,550,000 as proposed by the House and $26,887,000 as proposed by the Senate and deletes language inserted by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for oil shale research at Laramie, Wyo.

The conferees direct that the Bureau revise its coal research program for fiscal year 1963 so as to allocate not less than $2,400,000 (in lieu of the $1,920,000 budgeted) among the 20 highest priority research areas (as outlined by the Office of Coal Research) appearing to have the greatest promise of developing new markets for coal.

Amendment No. 20: Provides additional borrowing authority of $6,000,000 for the development and operation of helium properties as proposed by the House instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $3,450,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $750,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $875,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees direct that exploration loans be discontinued on lead, zinc, and copper.

Fish and Wildlife Service

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $15,225,000 for management and investigation of resources instead of $14,600,000 as proposed by the House and $15,981,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House allowance provides for the following: $325,000 for expanded biological research on shrimp in the Gulf of Mexico; $100,000 for research and development of shrimp gear; and $200,000 for Atlantic herring research.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $8,473,000 for construction as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,900,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill includes $413,000 for equipment for the laboratories at Seattle, Wash., and Ann Arbor,

Mich., and $160,000 for purchase of land and land filling to initiate construction of the Shellfish Research Center at Milford, Conn.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $27,112,000 for management and investigations of resources instead of $26,500,000 as proposed by the House and $27,436,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for the following: $100,000 for increased technical assistance in sport fishing management through cooperative programs with Indian tribes (in addition, not less than $100,000 of the funds available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for economic development shall be allocated to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for this work); $150,000 for establishment of cooperative fishery units (at a unit cost of $30,000) at the University of Georgia, Louisiana State University, Colorado State University, North Carolina State College, and University of Missouri; $17,000 for a cooperative wildlife research unit at South Dakota State College; $105,000 for increased fish control research in waters of the Southeastern United States; $85,000 for increased reservoir research in the White River interstate Reservoir complex in northern Arkansas and southern Missouri; $25,000 for continuation of the fishery management project at Springville, Utah; $100,000 for research on control and eradication of nutria; and $30,000 for expansion of predator control work in Arkansas.

Amendment No. 26: Deletes language inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $6,922,300 for construction instead of $4,900,000 as proposed by the House and $8,033,800 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $330,000 to initiate construction of the Northern Great Plains Wildlife Research Station, N. Dak.; $125,000 for improvements at the Federal Fish Farm Experiment Station, Kelso, Ark.; $340,000 for establishment of a fish genetics facility in Wyoming; and construction at the following national fish hatcheries: Alchesay, Ariz., $93,000; Gavins Point, S. Dak., $60,000; Cohutta, Ga., $164,300; Bowden, W. Va., $62,000; Hagerman, Idaho, $100,000; Leadville, Colo., $65,000; Marion, Ala., $165,000; Lyman, Miss., $127,000; Quilcene, Wash., $132,000; Grerrs Ferry, Ark., $170,000; and Ennis, Mont., $89,000. The amount provided includes $20,000 for a dock, pier, and sanitary facilities at the De Soto Wildlife Refuge.

The conferees agree that the staff for administration of the migratory bird conservation account should be limited to not to exceed 200 positions.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $1,250,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the House instead of $1,331,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Provides for purchase of not to exceed 124 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 117 as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $7,600,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $7,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Provides a limitation of $525,000 for administration and coordination as proposed by the House instead of $625,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $2,000,000 for operation and maintenance as proposed by the House instead of $2,085,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Provides a limitation of $175,000 for administration under operation and maintenance as proposed by the House instead of $225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $3,675,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $3,600,000 as proposed by the House and $3,747,000 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $3,350,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,340,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided reflects changes in the House allowance as follows: A decrease of $10,000 for the Office of Information and an increase of $10,000 for administrative management services.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $139,400,000 for forest land management instead of $138,400,000 as proposed by the House and $141,045,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $800,000 for timber sales administration and management and $200,000 for land acquisition. Within the amount provided for land acquisition, it is suggested that the Forest Service give consideration to the purchase of Manistee National Forest lands on the Lake Michigan shore.

Amendment No. 37: Provides limitation of $500,000 on land acquisition instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House and $805,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $24,835,000 for forest research instead of $22,975,000 as proposed by the House and $25,865,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $60,000 for expansion of study of timber processing and marketing problems in Kentucky; $200,000 for planning the wood chemistry and

pulp and paper laboratory at Madison, Wis.; and construction of research facilities as follows: Alexandria, La., $450,000; Parsons, W. Va., $150,000; Logan, Utah, $300,000; Warren, Pa., $250,000; and Tempe, Ariz., $450,000.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $15,830,000 for State and private forestry cooperation instead of $15,800,000 as proposed by the House and $16,405,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for forestry work in the Virgin Islands.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $2,000,000 for access roads instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Provides for the appropriation of $20,000 from forest receipts for acquisition of lands in the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $1,000,000 for assistance to States for tree planting as proposed by the House instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Provides for the purchase of not to exceed 165 passenger motor vehicles instead of 152 as proposed by the House and 179 as proposed by the Senate.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $80,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $70,000 as proposed by the House.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $55,834,000 for Indian health activities instead of $55,284,000 as proposed by the House and $57,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is to provide a direct appropriation to replace the present contractual authority utilized for making advance purchases for Alaska activities.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $9,335,000 for construction of Indian health facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,320,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for construction of sanitation facilities, including $438,000 for sanitation facilities on the former Menominee Reservation as authorized by Public Law 87–432, and $115,000 for planning a general medical and surgical hospital at Lawton, Okla.

National Capital Transportation Agency

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $3,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $3,350,000 as proposed by the House and $2,825,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction from the House bill represents a decrease of $200,000 for engineering plans and a decrease of $150,000 for engineering feasibility analyses.

Limitation on Unit Cost of Employee Housing

The managers on the part of the House direct that the unit cost of employee housing (regardless of the source of financing) in the United States, including Alaska and Hawaii and the territories, shall not exceed $20,000. The limitation includes engineering and design costs but excludes provision of utilities to the lot line. Any exceptions to this monetary limitation shall continue to be submitted to the committee for its advance review and approval.

Employee houses shall not exceed the following standards: (1) Standard materials, millwork, equipment, and fixtures that are readily available at local supply centers will be used in all dwelling construction; (2) design will be simple with no features that increase building costs such as irregularities in rough framing; (3) not to exceed 1½ baths; (4) one-stall garage in areas subject to deep snow or prolonged periods of below freezing temperatures, carports in warmer climates; (5) sun porches, enclosed patios, or similar features will not be provided; (6) floor area shall not exceed—two-bedroom dwelling, 1,250 square feet; three-bedroom dwelling, 1,300 square feet, exclusive of basement and garage space (or service and storage space in lieu of basement); (7) no four-bedroom dwellings shall be permitted; and (8) fireplaces will not be permitted except where essential for adequate heating.

Michael J. Kirwan,
Don Magnuson,
Clarence Cannon,
Ben F. Jensen,
Managers on the part of the House.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the favorable editorial concerning the appointment of this distinguished Ohioan to a Cabinet post bearing on the lives of every American citizen.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. MAYOR TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Running the health, education, and welfare problems of a large and complex city like Cleveland, Ohio, is probably as good a steppingstone as any to doing the same for the Nation.

Cleveland's Mayor Anthony Celebrezze apparently did a good and popular job in his hometown. Its citizens elected him to office five times.

Thus it appears certain President Kennedy has made an appropriate choice in naming Mayor Celebrezze to his Cabinet. The mayor is the first American of Italian descent to achieve Cabinet rank. If his appointment means the Cabinet will further represent the varied yet homogeneous makeup of our country, so much the better.

COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE SYSTEM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. MANSFIELD to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11040) to provide for the establishment, ownership, operation, and regulation of a commercial communications satellite system, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask for a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair) Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair first determine for what purpose the Senator from Texas is yielding.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I have yielded to the distinguished Senator from Oregon for the purpose of his suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask that it be a live quorum.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does the fact that the absence of a quorum has been suggested constitute one speech insofar as the able Senator from Texas is concerned?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first speech of the Senator from Texas has been terminated. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 135 Leg.]

Holland	Metcalf	Thurmond
Hruska	Morse	Yarborough
Kefauver	Mundt	
Kerr	Smathers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

RECESS TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recess in accordance with the previous order.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate recessed until tomorrow, Saturday, July 28, 1962, at 10 a.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1962

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, July 30, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

Pursuant to an order of the House on Thursday, July 26, 1962, the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, is herewith printed, as follows:

[Submitted by Mr. KIRWAN]

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2049)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 17, 18, 20, 22, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, and 42.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 24, 29, 41, 44, and 46; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$41,510,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$81,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$53,775,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,622,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$40,775,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "$26,675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,112,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,922,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,675,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$139,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,835,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39; and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,830,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "sixty-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$55,834,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 9.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ALAN BIBLE,
ROBERT C. BYRD,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments; namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Public land management

Bureau of Land Management

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $41,510,200 for management of lands and resources instead of $39,375,000 as proposed by the House and $43,022,200 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase provided over the House bill reflects a decrease of $129,800 in funds for information and publications personnel and increases as follows: $2,000,000 for rehabilitation of rangelands; and $265,000 for cadastral surveys.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $81,300,000 for education and welfare services instead of $81,000,000 as proposed by the House and $82,827,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for expenses of educating Indian children in Federal facilities.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $34,300,000 for resources management as proposed by the House instead of $34,677,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided includes $70,000 for maintenance of roads on the Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $53,775,000 for construction instead of $52,000,000 as proposed by the House and $55,550,000 as proposed by the Senate. It is expected that the Agency will undertake with the

amount provided construction of the complete budgeted program including the Chiiocco shop building, the Wahpeton dormitories, and the Phoenix classroom building, and the Laguna Consolidated School, New Mexico. The conferees believe that through the exercise of stricter controls the Agency should be able to achieve greater economies in planning and construction costs than anticipated in the estimates.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $16,000,000 for road construction (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the House instead of $17,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that the Department should provide for the full authorized program for regular Indian roads. In addition, the amount approved includes $230,000 for completion of grading and base course required for the Toreva-Winslow Road, Arizona.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $4,000,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the House instead of $4,350,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount, together with the transfer of not to exceed $2,900,000 from program funds, will provide a total of $6,900,000.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Provide for the purchase of not to exceed 220 passenger motor vehicles, including 50 for police-type use, as proposed by the House instead of 230, including 71 for police-type use, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in disagreement.

National Park Service

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $25,525,000 for management and protection instead of $25,425,000 as proposed by the House and $26,034,320 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for additional U.S. Park Police. The conferees direct that not less than $1,101,096 of the amount provided shall be transferred to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, representing the amounts programed under this item for fiscal year 1962 for "Nationwide recreation planning" ($504,337) and "Cooperation with States and other agencies" ($596,759).

Amendment No. 11: Provides limitation of $8,622,000 on the amount of funds available for acquisition of lands instead of $8,409,000 as provided by the House and $11,635,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $213,000 in the House bill limitation is for acquisition of 133 acres of the Henry Claggett tract at Mockley Point on the Potomac River shore opposite Mount Vernon.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $40,775,500 for construction instead of $40,000,000 as proposed by the House and $44,526,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $213,000 for acquiring the Mockley Point tract opposite Mount Vernon as indicated above; $172,500 for restoration of the Appomattox Courthouse; $240,000 for construction of a visitor center at Kennesaw Mountain National Historical Park; and $150,000 for stabilizing the banks of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal outside the areas of possible inundation under the water resources projects proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

Amendment No. 13: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees agree that no part of the $213,200 provided under the item "Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)" for resurfacing the Chesapeake & Ohio towpath shall be expended in any areas of possible inundation under the water resources projects proposed by the Corps of Engineers.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $1,964,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,900,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is to provide full funding for the 40 existing positions which are to be transferred to this item from the construction appropriation.

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Provide for the purchase of not to exceed 152 passenger motor vehicles, including 57 for police-type use, as proposed by the Senate instead of 135, including 50 for police-type use, as proposed by the House.

Mineral resources

Geological Survey

Amendment No. 17: Deletes language inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $56,100,000 for surveys, investigations, and research as proposed by the House instead of $56,900,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree that no action should be taken by the Department to establish an Institute of Water Research.

Bureau of Mines

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $26,675,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of $26,550,000 as proposed by the House and $26,887,000 as proposed by the Senate and deletes language inserted by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for oil shale research at Laramie, Wyo.

The conferees direct that the Bureau revise its coal research program for fiscal year 1963 so as to allocate not less than $2,400,000 (in lieu of the $1,920,000 budgeted) among the 20 highest priority research areas (as outlined by the Office of Coal Research) appearing to have the greatest promise of developing new markets for coal.

Amendment No. 20: Provides additional borrowing authority of $6,000,000 for the development and operation of helium properties as proposed by the House instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Coal Research

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $3,450,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Minerals Exploration

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $750,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $875,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees direct that exploration loans be discontinued on lead, zinc, and copper.

Fish and Wildlife Service

Bureau of Commercial Fisheries

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $15,225,000 for management and investigation of resources instead of $14,600,000 as proposed by the House and $15,981,500 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House allowance provides for the following: $325,000 for expanded biological research on shrimp in the Gulf of Mexico; $100,000 for research and development of shrimp gear; and $200,000 for Atlantic herring research.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $8,473,000 for construction as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,900,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill includes $413,000 for equipment for the laboratories at Seattle, Wash., and Ann Arbor, Mich., and $160,000 for purchase of land and land filling to initiate construction of the Shellfish Research Center at Milford, Conn.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $27,112,000 for management and investigations of resources instead of $26,500,000 as proposed by the House and $27,436,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill is for the following: $100,000 for increased technical assistance in sport fishing management through cooperative programs with Indian tribes (in addition, not less than $100,000 of the funds available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for economic development shall be allocated to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for this work); $150,000 for establishment of cooperative fishery units (at a unit cost of $30,000) at the University of Georgia, Louisiana State University, Colorado State University, North Carolina State College, and University of Missouri; $17,000 for a cooperative wildlife research unit at South Dakota State College; $105,000 for increased fish control research in waters of the Southeastern United States; $85,000 for increased reservoir research in the White River interstate reservoir complex in northern Arkansas and southern Missouri; $25,000 for continuation of the fishery management project at Springville, Utah; $100,000 for research on control and eradication of nutria; and $30,000 for expansion of predator control work in Arkansas.

Amendment No. 26: Deletes language inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates $6,922,300 for construction instead of $4,900,000 as proposed by the House and $8,033,800 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: $330,000 to initiate construction of the Northern Great Plains Wildlife Research Station, N. Dak.; $125,000 for improvements at the Federal Fish Farm Experiment Station, Kelso, Ark.; $340,000 for establishment of a fish genetics facility in Wyoming; and construction at the following national fish hatcheries: Alchesay, Ariz., $93,000; Gavins Point, S. Dak., $60,000; Cohutta, Ga., $164,300; Bowden, W. Va., $62,000; Hagerman, Idaho, $100,000; Leadville, Colo., $65,000; Marion, Ala., $165,000; Lyman, Miss., $127,000; Quilcene, Wash., $132,000; Greers Ferry, Ark., $170,000; and Ennis, Mont., $89,000. The amount provided includes $20,000 for a dock, pier, and sanitary facilities at the De Soto Wildlife Refuge.

The conferees agree that the staff for administration of the migratory bird conservation account should be limited to not to exceed 200 positions.

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $1,250,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the House instead of $1,331,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Provides for purchase of not to exceed 124 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 117 as proposed by the House.

Office of Saline Water

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $7,600,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of $7,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Provides a limitation of $525,000 for administration and coordination as proposed by the House instead of $625,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $2,000,000 for operation and maintenance as proposed by the House instead of $2,085,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Provides a limitation of $175,000 for administration under operation and maintenance as proposed by the House instead of $225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $3,675,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $3,600,000 as proposed by the House and $3,747,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $3,350,000 as proposed by the House instead of $3,340,000 as proposed by the Senate. The amount provided reflects changes in the House allowance as follows: a decrease of $10,000 for the Office of Information and an increase of $10,000 for administrative management services.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $139,400,000 for forest land management instead of $138,400,000 as proposed by the House and $141,045,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes $800,000

for timber sales administration and management and $200,000 for land acquisition. Within the amount provided for land acquisition, it is suggested that the Forest Service give consideration to the purchase of Manistee National Forest lands on the Lake Michigan shore.

Amendment No. 37: Provides limitation of $500,000 on land acquisition instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House and $805,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $24,835,000 for forest research instead of $22,975,000 as proposed by the House and $25,865,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: $60,000 for expansion of study of timber processing and marketing problems in Kentucky; $200,000 for planning the wood chemistry and pulp and paper laboratory at Madison, Wis.; and construction of research facilities as follows: Alexandria, La., $450,000; Parsons, W. Va., $150,000; Logan, Utah, $300,000; Warren, Pa., $250,000; and Tempe, Ariz., $450,000.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $15,830,000 for State and private forestry cooperation instead of $15,800,000 as proposed by the House and $16,405,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for forestry work in the Virgin Islands.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $2,000,000 for access roads instead of $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Provides for the appropriation of $20,000 from forest receipts for acquisition of lands in the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $1,000,000 for assistance to States for tree planting as proposed by the House instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Provides for the purchase of not to exceed 165 passenger motor vehicles instead of 152 as proposed by the House and 179 as proposed by the Senate.

Commission of Fine Arts

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $80,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $70,000 as proposed by the House.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $55,834,000 for Indian health activities instead of $55,284,000 as proposed by the House and $57,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is to provide a direct appropriation to replace the present contractural authority utilized for making advance purchases for Alaska activities.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $9,335,000 for construction of Indian health facilities as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,320,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for construction of sanitation facilities, including $438,000 for sanitation facilities on the former Menominee Reservation as authorized by Public Law 87-432, and $115,000 for planning a general medical and surgical hospital at Lawton, Okla.

National Capital Transportation Agency

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $3,000,000 for salaries and expenses instead of $3,350,000 as proposed by the House and $2,825,000 as proposed by the Senate. The reduction from the House bill represents a decrease of $200,000 for engineering plans and a decrease of $150,000 for engineering feasibility analyses.

Limitation on unit cost of employee housing

The managers on the part of the House direct that the unit cost of employee housing (regardless of the source of financing) in the United States, including Alaska and Hawaii and the territories, shall not exceed $20,000. The limitation includes engineering and design costs but excludes provision of utilities to the lot line. Any exceptions to this monetary limitation shall continue to be submitted to the committee for its advance review and approval.

Employee houses shall not exceed the following standards: (1) Standard materials, millwork, equipment, and fixtures that are readily available at local supply centers will be used in all dwelling construction; (2) design will be simple with no features that increase building costs such as irregularities in rough framing; (3) not to exceed 1½ baths; (4) one-stall garage in areas subject to deep snow or prolonged periods of below-freezing temperatures, carports in warmer climates; (5) sun porches, enclosed patios, or similar features will not be provided; (6) floor area shall not exceed—two-bedroom dwelling, 1,250 square feet; three-bedroom dwelling, 1,300 square feet—exclusive of basement and garage space (or service and storage space in lieu of basement); (7) no four-bedroom dwellings shall be permitted; and (8) fireplaces will not be permitted except where essential for adequate heating.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
DON MAGNUSON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued July 31, 1962
For actions of July 28 & 30, 1962
87th-2d, Nos. 130 & 131

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....16
Appropriations.....1,2,25
Civil defense.....2
Communications.....15,17
Education.....11
Electrification.....20
Employment.....24
Experiment stations.....21
Extension work.....4,21
Farm housing.....6
Farm program.....12
Food additives.....22
Food for peace.....18
Foreign affairs.....8
Forest Service.....1
Forestry.....3,30
Health benefits.....9
Housing.....6
Information.....23
Lands.....3,10
Life insurance.....26
Loans.....7,29
Meatpackers.....29
Mineral leases.....27
Mining.....5
Nominations.....31
Oyster loans.....7.29
Patents.....32
Peace Corps.....13
Personnel.....9,24,26
Property.....23
Public facilities.....7
Research.....2,3,21
Small business.....19
Transportation.....28
Water pollution.....14
Weather.....32

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference report on Interior appropriation bill. House began debate on independent offices appropriation bill. Rep. Fountain defended his subcommittee's action in Estes case. House committee reported bills for expansion of survey of forest resources, to aid States in forestry research, increase authorization under Cooperative Forest Management Act, provide additional research facilities for experiment stations, revise distribution formula for extension funds, and add certain lands to national forests. House committee reported bill for housing for elderly in rural areas.

HOUSE - July 30

1. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Agreed to the Conference report on this bill, H. R. 10802, and acted on the amendment in disagreement (relating to Indian claims) (pp. 13975-7). See Digest 129 for a summary of Forest Service items.

2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Began and concluded general debate on this bill, H. R. 12711 (pp. 13980-14019). This bill was reported by the Appropriations Committee on July 27, during adjournment of the House (H. Rept. 2050) (p. 14030). Agreed to an amendment by Rep. Miller, Calif., to provide that none of the funds shall be used to pay any recipient of a grant for the conduct of a research project an amount for indirect expenses in connection with the project in excess of 25 percent of the direct costs (the bill as reported provided a limitation of 20 percent)(p. 14014-18). The bill includes funds for the Office of Emergency Planning (including civil defense and defense

mobilization functions of Federal agencies), Office of Science and Technology, Civil Service Commission, Federal Trade Commission, General Accounting Office, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Science Foundation, and Veterans Administration.

3. FORESTRY. The Agriculture Committee reported the following bills:
S. 3064, with amendment, to increase the authorization for the national survey of forest resources (H. Rept. 2063);
S. 3112, with amendment, to add certain lands to the Pike National Forest in Colo. and the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests in N. M. (H. Rept. 2064);
H. R. 12688, with amendment, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist the States in carrying on a program of forestry research (H. Rept. 2065);
H. R. 7195, with amendment, to add certain lands to the Wasatch National Forest, Utah (H. Rept. 2066);
H. R. 9728, without amendment, to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act to increase the appropriation authorization from $2.5 million to $5 million (H. Rept. 2067). p. 10430

4. EXTENSION WORK. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12589, to amend the Smith-Lever Act so as to revise the formula for apportioning funds among the States (H. Rept. 2068). p. 14030

5. MINING. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 9280, to amend Sec. 2 of the Materials Act (H. Rept. 2055); H. R. 10540, to exclude deposits of petrified wood from appropriation under the U. S. mining laws (H. Rept. 2056); and H. R. 11049, to provide for the relief of certain oil and gas lessees under the Mineral Leasing Act (H. Rept. 2057). p. 14030

6. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency Committee reported on July 28 (during adjournment of the House) with amendment H. R. 12628, to authorize a program of housing for the elderly in rural areas (H. Rept. 2052). p. 14030

7. LOANS. Concurred in the Senate amendments to H. R. 7336, to promote the production of oysters by propagation of disease-resistant strains. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 13975
The Banking and Currency Committee reported on July 28 (during adjournment of the House) with amendment S. 3327, to make certain federally impacted areas eligible for assistance under the public facility loan program (H. Rept. 2051). p. 13975

8. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The Foreign Affairs Committee issued a report pertaining to a center for culture and technical interchange between East and West (H. Rept. 2060). p. 14030

9. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill "to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contribution for expenses incurred in the administration of such act"; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 14030

10. PUBLIC LANDS. The Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendment H. R. 11266, to amend the act of March 8, 1922, to extend its provisions to the townsite laws applicable in Alaska. p. D654

11. EDUCATION. Rep. Green, Ore., urged the conferees to agree to file a conference report on H. R. 8900, the proposed College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act. pp. 14021-2

in search of truth. And Charlie is just the sort of man who will continue to search until he gets to the bottom of a story.

Personally, there are many things I would like to say to Charlie for his dedication and service, but these seem to be just added words. Charlie Haslet does not need speeches, he does not have to be praised to do the good job. Charlie, in the best tradition of the Associated Press, is a journalist. He is a sturdy bulwark in the search for truth.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT, PEACE CORPS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 11 of the Peace Corps Act, I transmit herewith the first annual report on operations under the act covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1962.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 27, 1962.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 179]

Alford	Dwyer	Lindsay
Alger	Ellsworth	Loser
Anfuso	Farbstein	McDowell
Ashbrook	Findley	McSween
Ashley	Fino	McVey
Baker	Flood	Macdonald
Baring	Flynt	MacGregor
Barry	Frazier	Martin, Mass.
Bass, N.H.	Garland	Mason
Bates	Giaimo	Merrow
Battin	Glenn	Miller, N.Y.
Blitch	Granahan	Minshall
Boggs	Gray	Moorehead, Ohio
Bolton	Griffin	Morrison
Boykin	Halpern	Morse
Brademas	Hardy	Moulder
Breeding	Harris	Multer
Brewster	Harrison, Va.	Nedzi
Bromwell	Harrison, Wyo.	Nelsen
Buckley	Harsha	Nix
Byrnes, Wis.	Hays	O'Brien, N.Y.
Cahill	Healey	Osmers
Carey	Hébert	Peterson
Celler	Hiestand	Pfost
Chamberlain	Hoffman, Ill.	Pilcher
Chenoweth	Hoffman, Mich.	Pirnie
Church	Ichord, Mo.	Powell
Clark	Jennings	Pucinski
Coad	Johnson, Md.	Purcell
Cohelan	Kastenmeier	Rains
Conte	Kearns	Randall
Cook	Kee	Riley
Cooley	Kelly	Rivers, S.C.
Curtis, Mass.	Keogh	Rooney
Davis, James C.	Kilburn	Roosevelt
Davis, Tenn.	King, Utah	Roudebush
Dawson	Kitchin	St. George
Diggs	Kluczynski	St. Germain
Dingell	Kowalski	Santangelo
Dooley	Latta	Saund
Dulski	Lesinski	Scherer
Spence	Whalley	
Scranton	Springer	Wharton
Seely-Brown	Stafford	Wickersham
Shelley	Stratton	Widnall
Shipley	Stubblefield	Willis
Short	Taber	Wilson, Calif.
Siler	Thompson, La.	Wilson, Ind.
Slack	Thornberry	Winstead
Smith, Iowa	Wallhauser	Wright
Smith, Miss.	Westland	Zelenko

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 281 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceeding under the call were dispensed with.

TO PROMOTE THE PRODUCTION OF OYSTERS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7336) an act to promote the production of oysters by propagation of disease-resistant strains, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out *"Providing,"* and insert *"Provided,"*.

Page 2, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make grants to the States referred to in the first section of this Act for the purpose of assisting such States in the financing of research and other activities necessary in the development and propagation of disease-resistant strains of oysters. A grant under this section shall be made upon agreement by the State to use the proceeds thereof only for the purposes specified in this section and to use an additional amount for such purposes from State or other non-Federal sources equal to at least 50 per centum of the amount of such grant."

Page 2, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated such sum, not to exceed $100,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF U.S.S. "ALASKA" TO STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 3788) to provide for the transfer of the U.S. vessel *Alaska* to the State of California for the use and benefit of the department of fish and game of such State, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "donate and":

After line 12, insert:

"SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this Act shall (1) be conditional upon the State of California paying to the Secretary of the Interior, as consideration for the vessel conveyed, an amount equal to fifty percent of the fair market value of such vessel at the time it was leased by the State of California, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior; and (2) provided that such vessel shall be used for a public purpose and if it should cease to be so used, all right, title, and interest therein shall immediately revert to the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 27, 1962.)

(Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include a table.)

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference action provides a total of $885,362,000 for fiscal year 1963 for the Department of Interior—excluding the Bureau of Reclamation and the power agencies—and certain related agencies including the U.S. Forest Service and the Indian health activities.

The conference total, which is a decrease of $47,312,000, or 5 percent, under the budget estimate, represents an increase of $16,767,000 over the House bill and a decrease of $37,198,820 from the Senate bill. It should be noted that the increase over the House bill includes provision of $2 million requested in a budget amendment which was not considered by the House.

The appropriations allowed for 1963 represent an increase of $44,365,350 over the 1962 appropriations. However, the effective increase is $84,235,350 when the 1962 figures are adjusted on a comparable basis to deduct the forest fire and storm damage deficiencies appropriated in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1962.

I believe this bill makes very adequate provision for the many essential additional requirements that must be provided for if we are to preserve and develop our great national resources, including the national forests and parks, public lands and minerals, fish and wildlife, and make adequate provision for the education and care of the American Indians and their resources.

SUMMARY OF APPROPRIATIONS

Major items in the bill include $117,264,500 for the National Park Service, an

increase of $9,277,000 over comparable figures for 1962; $258,544,000 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian health activities under the Public Health Service, an increase of $32,865,000; $105,872,000 for mineral resources, including Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, and the Office of Coal Research, an increase of $4,956,000; $67,996,300 for the Fish and Wildlife Service, an increase of $16,345,150 over comparable 1962 figures; and $223,295,000 for the U.S. Forest Service, an increase of $14,167,000 over the 1962 appropriations adjusted to exclude the forest fire deficiency item.

LAND OPPOSITE MOUNT VERNON

The bill includes $213,000 for acquisition of 133 acres at Mockley Point on the Potomac River shore opposite Mount Vernon as authorized by Public Law 87–362. This purchase, together with the some 600 acres to be donated to the United States by foundations and the donations of scenic easements, should make adequate provision for the preservation of the view from Mount Vernon. In addition, this area is now under adequate planning and zoning controls by the Prince Georges County Commissioners and the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Any additional funding of park land acquisition in this area should be the responsibility of this latter body which has recently undertaken a program to acquire some 19,000 acres at a cost of $30 million.

REDUCTIONS IN TRAVEL, SUPPLIES, AND EQUIPMENT

In general, the Senate bill restored the 5-percent cuts which the House had made in travel, supplies and materials, and equipment in an effort to get the agencies to exercise stricter controls over these expenditures. The Senate conferees agreed to go along with the House figure in each of these items and it is expected that all the agencies will take immediate steps to review policies and procedures governing expenditures for these purposes and take concerted action to assure that every effort is made to secure significant savings. The 1963 budget estimates for these objects for the Department of the Interior agencies covered by the bill showed a 50-percent increase over the actual obligations for fiscal year 1961. If the agencies do not take effective action in this regard, the committee may find it necessary to place limitations on these expenditures in next year's bill.

PERSONNEL INCREASES

I also wish to again emphasize our concern over the continuous stream of requests from the agencies to increase personnel. We do not believe that every effort is being made to secure maximus productivity from existing personnel and to shift individuals from work of lower priority to implement new or expanded essential activities.

For example, the House committee in its report directed the Bureau of Mines to curtail and defer some of the long-run coal research projects which it has had underway for several years in order to undertake some of the new high priority projects which appear to have great promise for the coal industry. But the Bureau reported back that it felt the $1,920,000 it had budgeted in these new important arcas—or only 23 percent of the $8,256,000 provided in the bill to the Bureau for coal research—was the maximum it could allocate. No effort was made by the Bureau to defer or curtail even one old line project. So the conferees have directed the Bureau to "revise its coal research program for fiscal year 1963 so as to allocate not less than $2,400,000—in lieu of the $1,920,000 budgeted—among the 20 highest priority research areas—as outlined by the Office of Coal Research—appearing to have the greatest promise of developing new markets for coal."

And I see no alternative to taking further action of this nature next year if the estimates submitted by the agencies do not reflect appropriate reductions in business-as-usual items in order to make funds and personnel available for new essential requirements. I feel strongly that effective action is long overdue to ferret out the old chestnuts and sacred cows which have been on the books for years and years, many without any appreciable results, and to shift the personnel and funds to new and expanded essential programs. We cannot afford to continue to finance both.

I will insert at this point a summary tabulation of the amounts in the bill.

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I—Department of the Interior:							
Total, definite appropriations	[1] $578,699,000	$547,379,000	$572,468,820	[1] $558,011,000	−$20,688,000	+$10,632,000	−$14,457,820
Total, indefinite appropriations of receipts	10,793,000	10,793,000	10,793,000	10,793,000			
Total, borrowing authorization	20,000,000	6,000,000	20,000,000	6,000,000	−14,000,000		−14,000,000
Total, Title I—Department of the Interior	609,492,000	564,172,000	603,261,820	574,804,000	−34,688,000	+10,632,000	−28,457,820
Title II—Related agencies:							
Total, definite appropriations	318,987,000	303,513,000	318,369,000	309,628,000	−9,359,000	+6,115,000	−8,741,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	710,000	710,000	730,000	730,000	+20,000	+20,000	
Total, Title II—Related agencies	319,697,000	304,223,000	319,099,000	310,358,000	−9,339,000	+6,135,000	−8,741,000
Title III—Virgin Islands Corporation	3,485,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	−3,285,000		
Grand total:							
Definite appropriations	901,171,000	851,092,000	891,037,820	867,839,000	−33,332,000	+16,747,000	−23,198,820
Indefinite appropriations of receipts	11,503,000	11,503,000	11,523,000	11,523,000	+20,000	+20,000	
Borrowing authorization	20,000,000	6,000,000	20,000,000	6,000,000	−14,000,000		−14,000,000
Total	932,674,000	868,595,000	922,560,820	885,362,000	−47,312,000	+16,767,000	−37,198,820

[1] Includes budget amendment (S. Doc. 88) of $2,000,000 not considered by House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There is nothing inserted in this conference report for a $20 million fish pond in the District of Columbia?

Mr. KIRWAN. No, nothing. The authorization bill for the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium has not yet been passed by the Senate.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. On amendment No. 19 I see they have added $125,000 for oil shale research at Laramie, Wyo. During the course of the debate on this bill in the House I introduced an amendment to add $187,000 for oil shale research at the Rifle, Colo., plant. In the Senate this provision for $187,000 did go through the committee and was added by the Senate. In amendment No. 19 you say you have deleted that language and instead of permitting the Bureau of Mines to conduct the oil shale research in the small retort in Rifle it is going to Wyoming. With the oil shale facilities we have in Rifle and the oil shale reserves we have in Colorado, I wonder why this was put in there.

Mr. KIRWAN. We agreed to $125,000 of the increase of $187,000 which had been added by the Senate. The bill carries the same amount as 1962 for Rifle.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wonder why you specifically said it was to go to Laramie instead of Rifle.

Mr. KIRWAN. The original budget request from the Bureau of Mines provided that this expanded work would be done by Bureau personnel at the Laramie Petroleum Research Center.

Mr. DOMINICK. You have added $125,000 for oil shale research in the small retort, but you have specifically said it was to go to Wyoming instead of Colorado while a good deal of the actual work will involve the new oil shale deposits now under evaluation at Piceance

Creek, Colo., only a short distance from Rifle.

Mr. KIRWAN. It was my understanding the Senate increase was for additional research by personnel at Laramie.

Mr. DOMINICK. Does the gentleman know the small retorts are already in Rifle, not at Laramie? All you do here is take it out of the facility at Rifle and move it up there.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman from Iowa is sitting right beside the gentleman. He has inspected both of these places and I wonder if he would like to comment on this.

Mr. JENSEN. When the facilities were at Rifle some years ago it was in my mind that somebody on the committee ought to go out there and take a look at it, so along with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] I went to Rifle. We went into that tunnel. It was about 70 feet high. There was no support in the tunnel. They had two ceiling failures. One of them fell on a steamshovel on a Sunday and smashed it flat. Had men been working there I do not know how many men would have lost their lives, but the good Lord let that ceiling fall on a Sunday. We immediately moved out of that tunnel.

They had been taking tours consisting of bus loads of people into that tunnel, and I insisted that such tours should be discontinued. Let us not permit anyone else to go into this tunnel until supports can be built or something done to insure that the ceiling would not fall. Then, of course, we were told that gasoline could be extracted from shale for only 1 cent more than it could be in the regular refining processes, and that there was no further need for experimenting in that field.

Hence the committee felt, since we were told that the research facilities at Laramie were of a more up to date kind to extract oil from shale, that we should put greater emphasis on Laramie. In the bill this year, the House allowed the budget request of $733,000, the same as the amount for fiscal year 1962 for oil shale research which includes $200,000 for standby maintenance for the Rifle facilities. The Senate added $187,000 for research at Laramie. The Senate conferees put up quite a fight for the full amount, and we finally agreed on $125,000. These shale deposits at Rifle are owned by the Navy and it is my opinion and the opinion, I think, of the entire Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department that the Navy should take over this responsibility and carry on, if they see fit to do so. But, the facts are that the extraction of oil from shale has reached the point of efficiency, where it is close enough to being economically competitive and I, for one, see no reason why the Government should spend another dime at either Rifle or at Laramie for this program.

But, I am just one member of the committee and the Senate conferees were so adamant that we finally did agree on an increase $125,000.

Mr. KIRWAN. The answer is very simple. We left the same amount of money in the bill as we had last year for Rifle. The Bureau of Mines requested this increase for personnel at Laramie.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOMINICK. The record of the hearing before the House subcommittee indicated that the Bureau of Mines wanted to use this for small retort research at either Rifle or Laramie, according to how they felt it could best be used. Certainly we need and want more research in oil shale development which may be the most important petroleum reserves which are in this country. But I have great trouble in seeing why this should be launched for Wyoming when we already have an existing plant with good facilities and equipment at Rifle next door to the reserves themselves. I certainly hope that the House Armed Services Committee now considering this will take action so that these facilities may be used instead of merely sitting unused and creating expenses.

Mr. KIRWAN. I am speaking relative to the research work. The Senate increase was for work at Laramie and that was what was agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 9, line 5, insert: "Secretary, except that judgment funds awarded by the Indian Claims Commission or the Court of Claims and the interest thereon may be advanced to the tribes until a report of the purposes for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and both committees have approved the advance by committee resolution or neither committee has disapproved the advance by committee resolution within sixty calendar days from the date the report is submitted to the committees, not counting days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain".

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "Secretary, except that tribal funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims shall not be further appropriated until a report of the purposes for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and those purposes either have been approved by resolution of each of said committees or have not been disapproved by resolution of either of said committees within sixty calendar days from the date the report is submitted, not counting days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain:".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1963

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H.R. 11737, to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research, development, and operation; construction of facilities; and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of July 22, 1962.)

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us today for consideration the conference report on H.R. 11737, authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or fiscal year 1963.

As is indicated in the statement of the managers, the conference report authorizes total appropriations of $3,477,115,250. This is $72,953,250 in excess of the amount authorized in the House bill.

I would like to take this time to explain the action of the managers on the part of the House at the conference held with the Senate on this bill.

Insofar as authorizations for "Research, development, and operations" is concerned, the House bill had reduced the NASA request by $33,316,250. With the exception of a $400,000 item in the prospector program, it was necessary for the managers on the part of the House to agree to restore this reduction.

It must be kept in mind that the hearings on this authorization bill by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, were held some time ago. At that time, the committee, and the House, felt justified in reducing certain programs in research and development.

However, since that time, an extremely important decision has been made by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with regard to the lunar mission.

I have reference to the decision to use the lunar orbit rendevous technique, in order to place men on the moon and safely return them to earth in this decade.

It is estimated that this will speed up the accomplishment of the lunar program by 1 to 2 years. It is also hopefully estimated that it will reduce the eventual overall cost of the lunar program by 10 to 15 percent.

However, in order to accomplish this mission on this speeded-up timetable, certain programs must be emphasized, and sufficient authorization of funds provided.

Let me give you one or two examples:

The House reduced the administration request for Project Mercury by $1 million, on the basis that only two of the three three-orbit Mercury shots planned, would be necessary. However, two six-orbit flights are now planned. This necessitates additional recovery forces in the Pacific, which must be paid for by the Mercury authorization.

Thus, a stepped-up change in programing makes it necessary for us to restore this cut.

By the same token, we reduced the request for scientific satellites by $8,758,250. But, because of the decision on the lunar orbit rendevous techniques, we find it is essential that two additional scientific satellite launches must be made in fiscal year 1963.

Because of the stepped-up lunar program, it is imperative that we have information on solar activity.

Now, in the "Construction of facilities," we again had to restore certain items because of the stepped-up lunar program. The Senate agreed to our reduction of $3 million for the advanced Saturn launch complex at Cape Canaveral. But, at the same time, the House conferees agreed to a $32 million increase for the purchase of an additional 14,800 acres of land at the Atlantic Missile Range.

The request for these funds came up to Congress after the House bill had been passed. Nonetheless, it is essential that we provide funds for this land acquisition.

It is necessary to construct additional launch complexes for the lunar program, and to provide a safety zone between these launch sites and inhabited areas. Also, a new launch vehicle, Titan III, has been added to the program, for which launch facilities must be provided at the Atlantic Missile Range.

Without the purchase of the additional land, there is simply no way that these necessary additional launch complexes could be constructed, since land presently owned by NASA is insufficient.

In the case of certain other items, such as the House reduction of $5 million for "Advanced facility planning and design," the House and the Senate compromised, and agreed to an $8 million authorization for this item, rather than to the $10 million requested by NASA and authorized by the Senate amendment.

The House bill had reduced the administration request for "Construction of facilities," at the Mississippi test facility, by $12 million. This was based on the premise that the construction of facilities could be delayed because of reprograming of the Nova project.

However, again we are met with the need for additional facilities at the Mississippi site, due to the stepped-up lunar program. These facilities are for the testing of the second stage of the advanced Saturn. Consequently, the managers on the part of the House agreed to the restoration of the $12 million, so it could be used in the Saturn program.

We had made comparatively small reductions in the construction of tracking station facilities, but we agreed to the restoration of these funds, in order not to delay the space program.

When this authorization bill was considered in committee, as I have already stated, we felt perfectly justified in recommending certain reductions to the House, based on the testimony given us by representatives of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

At that time, we were convinced that none of our proposed reductions would slow down the national space program. However, since that time, and since the decision has been made to speed up the lunar program by use of the lunar orbit rendezvous technique, it is essential that many of our reductions must be restored.

If we failed to do so, there is no question in my mind that we would cause serious and irreparable harm to the new schedule of landing men on the moon, and providing for their safe return to earth.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the increase over the House figure?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. The increase is $72,953,200. Of this amount, there is included the $32 million for land acquisition.

Mr. GROSS. It is approximately $73 million above the House figure?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Yes; the House figure.

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that there are land acquisition costs now in the bill that were not considered by the House?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. There are land acquisition costs for 14,800 acres of additional land at Cape Canaveral in order to meet the new demands of the program that were not in the original request to the House.

Mr. GROSS. So, the House never considered the additional land acquisition in the authorization bill; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. That is correct; not in the authorization bill.

Mr. GROSS. What is the cost of this additional land?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Wait a minute; no. We did not consider it. At that time there was some question that, perhaps, the Defense Department might have bought this land.

Mr. GROSS. Was there not an appropriation for land acquisition for the same purpose in the deficiency appropriation bill that went through only a short time ago?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Yes. This is in addition to that.

Mr. GROSS. This is in addition to that?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. If I remember correctly, that dealt with Florida and Mississippi?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Now, this deals only with Cape Canaveral; is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Yes. This will take up all of the land that can be used as an addition to the Atlantic Missile Range, and is brought about as I have said by the fact that we have to have new launching sites for the lunar program and the Department of Defense has to have new sites for its Titan program. Inasmuch as NASA is a tenant on the lands of the Air Force down there and now they are going to become our tenants because you cannot put any more launch facilities on the present land at Cape Canaveral.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman state how much this additional land is going to cost?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. It is going to cost $32 million.

Mr. GROSS. For the land alone?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. The land alone; yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. We must realize that the land was originally going to be bought by the Department of Defense. It was to be used for NASA purposes. We felt that it should be studied and checked by the Science and Astronautics Committee and be bought by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] there was in the original request $55 million to buy 78,000 of Merritt Island acres at Cape Canaveral to meet the requirements for the Titan III booster program as well as the Advanced Saturn program.

Mr. Speaker, this new addition of $32 million is to purchase 14,800 acres of additional land north of Merritt Island. It also includes not only the cost of the land but the cost of relocating a section of the intercoastal waterway and a bridge as well.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert in the RECORD a table showing the various administration requests which have been approved by the House, approved by the Senate, and approved by the conferees on these various programs so that we may have the figures in plain view where everyone can read them in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The table referred to follows:

11. TERRITORIES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment S. 2429, to revise the boundaries of the Virgin Islands National Park, St. John, V. I. p. D667

12. MIGRANT WORKERS. Rep. Olsen discussed the problem of education of the children of migrant workers, and said, "If there ever was a cause or reason for Federal funds for education, it is for a program of education of children of agricultural migrant workers." pp. 14326-7

13. FOREIGN AID. Rep. Curtis, Mo., inserted an article by Dr. Hans Morgenthau, "A Political Theory of Foreign Aid." pp. 14332-6

SENATE

14. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield stated that the farm bill will not be considered for several days and that the policy committee will probably consider at its meeting next Tues. when to schedule it for debate. p. 14190

Sen. Cooper expressed opposition to including a mandatory feed-grain control program in the farm bill and stated that if the Administration insists on such a program "it will deliberately choose to have no farm bill." p. 14200

Sen. Proxmire expressed opposition to including a mandatory feed-grain control program in the farm bill and urged passage of the bill as reported by the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. pp. 14261-2

15. WHEAT. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report S. 3574, to extend authority granted under the International Wheat Agreement Act to cover any new or revised wheat agreement. p. D664

Sen. Carlson inserted a Disabled American Veterans resolution opposing shipment of wheat to Communist China. p. 14192

16. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 10802, and acted on the amendment in disagreement (relating to Indian claims)(pp. 14252-5). This bill will now be sent to the President. See Digest 129 for a summary of Forest Service items.

17. FORESTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3235, to provide authority for more efficient and effective administration of Forest Service programs (p. D664). See Digest 62-63 for provisions of this proposal as submitted by this Department.

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report with amendment (but did not actually report) S. 3117, to promote the coordination and development of Federal and State outdoor recreation programs. p. D665

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report with amendment (but did not actually report) S. 1878, to add certain lands to the Wasatch National Forest, Utah. p. D666

18. TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 10526. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 14238-43

19. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11289. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 14243 14251

20. RECLAMATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report with amendment (but did not actually report) H. R. 8520, to limit Federal financial and technical assistance for the drainage of certain wetlands. p. D664

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 103, with amendment, to authorize construction of the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, Calif., and S. 892, with amendment, to authorize construction of the Arbuckle reclamation project, Okla. p. D666

The "Daily Digest" states that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee "adopted a committee resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to initiate a study on Federal policies regarding limitations on delivery of wate from Federal projects to lands for irrigation purposes in excess of a specifie or limited number of acres in individual or family ownership." p. D666

21. PUBLIC LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report with amendment (but did not actually report) H. R. 8134, to authorize the sale of the mineral estate in certain lands. p. D665

22. WATERSHEDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved the following water shed projects: South Sumter and Upper Tampa Bay, Fla.; North Branch Mill Cree Mich.; Nanticoke Creek, N. Y.; Dicks Creek-Little Muddy Creek, O.; Line Creek, Tenn. and Ky.; Kent Creek, Tex.; Bajura, P.R.; and Davis-Battle Creek, Iowa. p. D664

23. FARM LABOR. Sens. Williams, N. J., and Humphrey expressed concern over the welfare of migratory farm workers and inserted several items on the matter. pp. 14207-8, 14218-9

24. HOUSING. The 15th Annual Report of the Housing and Home Finance Agency was received from the President and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. p. 14189

25. NOMINATION. The nomination of John Baker as Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and as a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation was confirmed without objection. p. 14191

26. PERSONNEL. Proposed legislation to amend the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act with respect to Government contributions for expenses incurred in administration of the Act was received from the U. S. Civil Service Commission and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. p. 14191.

27. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Carlson inserted resolutions opposing the recommendations of the Presidential Railroad Commission and supporting S. 3243, railroad legislation pending in the Commerce Committee.

The Commerce Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11643, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so that the users of motor-water services between Alaska or Hawaii and the other 48 States may have the same benefits of through routes and joint rates which are enjoyed by users or motor-water services among the other 48 States, and by users of rail-water services or any combination of service with air services among all of the 50 States (S. Rept. 1799). p. 14194

28. CONTRACTS. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported without amendment H. R. 11405, to provide for maintenance and repair of Government improvements under concession contracts in the National Parks (S. Rept. 1802). p.14194

29. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Goldwater submitted amendments intended to be proposed to S. 3153, to guarantee Pacific Northwest consumers first call on electricity generated at Federal plants in that region. p. 14196

Department of Defense, 1963—Summary of appropriations

Title	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I—Military personnel	$13,050,200,000	$12,901,890,000	$12,912,764,000	$12,903,690,000	−$146,510,000	+$1,800,000	−$9,074,000
Title II—Operation and maintenance	11,568,800,000	11,551,473,000	11,571,739,000	11,563,889,000	−4,911,000	+12,416,000	−7,850,000
Title III—Procurement	16,445,000,000	16,525,770,000	16,768,260,000	16,647,110,000	+202,110,000	+121,340,000	−121,150,000
Title IV—Research, development, test, and evaluation	6,843,000,000	6,860,358,000	7,176,458,000	7,021,558,000	+178,558,000	+161,200,000	−154,900,000
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	47,907,000,000	47,839,491,000	48,429,221,000	48,136,247,000	+229,247,000	+296,756,000	−292,974,000
Distribution of appropriations by organizational component:							
Army	11,654,000,000	11,546,567,000	11,616,067,000	11,574,067,000	−79,933,000	+27,500,000	−42,000,000
Navy	15,269,900,000	15,081,570,000	15,171,434,000	15,127,810,000	−142,090,000	+46,240,000	−43,624,000
Air Force	18,926,500,000	19,177,634,000	19,592,934,000	19,390,584,000	+464,084,000	+212,950,000	−202,350,000
Defense agencies	2,056,600,000	2,033,720,000	2,048,786,000	2,043,786,000	−12,814,000	+10,066,000	−5,000,000
Total, Department of Defense	47,907,000,000	47,839,491,000	48,429,221,000	48,136,247,000	+229,247,000	+296,756,000	−292,974,000

TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Military personnel, Army	[1] $3,733,000,000	[1] $3,643,300,000	[1] $3,643,300,000	[1] $3,643,300,000	−$89,700,000		
Mitary personnel, Navy	[2] 2,764,700,000	[2] 2,734,700,000	[2] 2,734,700,000	[2] 2,734,700,000	−30,000,000		
Military personnel, Marine Corps	671,300,000	661,200,000	661,200,000	661,200,000	−10,100,000		
Military personnel, Air Force	[3] 4,184,000,000	[3] 4,117,690,000	[3] 4,117,690,000	[3] 4,117,690,000	−66,310,000		
Reserve personnel, Army	[4] 214,700,000	239,200,000	239,200,000	239,200,000	+24,500,000		
Reserve personnel, Navy	83,800,000	83,800,000	87,974,000	85,800,000	+1,800,000	+$1,800,000	−$2,374,000
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps	28,100,000	28,100,000	28,100,000	28,100,000			
Reserve personnel, Air Force	50,100,000	50,100,000	56,800,000	50,100,000			−6,700,000
National Guard personnel, Army	[5] 238,500,000	261,800,000	261,800,000	261,800,000	+23,300,000		
National Guard personnel, Air Force	53,000,000	53,000,000	53,000,000	53,000,000			
Retired pay, Defense	1,029,000,000	1,029,000,000	1,029,000,000	1,029,000,000			
Total, title I, military personnel	13,050,200,000	12,901,890,000	12,912,764,000	12,903,690,000	−146,510,000	+1,800,000	−9,074,000

TITLE II—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Operation and maintenance, Army	$3,402,000,000		$3,411,845,000	$3,408,345,000	+$6,345,000	+$3,408,345,000	−$3,500,000
Operation, Army		$3,128,345,000				−3,128,345,000	
Maintenance of real property facilities, Army		275,000,000				−275,000,000	
Operation and maintenance, Navy	2,840,000,000		2,837,142,000	2,836,292,000	−3,708,000	+2,836,292,000	−850,000
Operation, Navy		2,671,916,000				−2,671,916,000	
Maintenance of real property facilities, Navy		163,526,000				−163,526,000	
Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps	191,000,000		193,000,000	192,500,000	+1,500,000	+192,500,000	−500,000
Operation, Marine Corps		170,682,000				−170,682,000	
Maintenance of real property facilities, Marine Corps		21,318,000				−21,318,000	
Marine Corps stock fund	[6]	[6]	[6]	[6]			
Operation and maintenance, Air Force	4,371,000,000		4,368,644,000	4,365,644,000	−5,356,000	+4,365,644,000	−3,000,000
Operation, Air Force		4,095,444,000				−4,095,444,000	
Maintenance of real property facilities, Air Force		269,200,000				−269,200,000	
Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies	354,145,000		350,331,000	350,331,000	−3,814,000	+350,331,000	
Operation, Defense agencies		332,048,000				−332,048,000	
Maintenance of real property facilities, Defense agencies		13,217,000				−13,217,000	
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard	174,400,000		174,400,000	174,400,000		+174,400,000	
Operation, Army National Guard		171,800,000				−171,800,000	
Maintenance of real property facilities, Army National Guard		2,600,000				−2,600,000	
Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard	194,400,000		194,400,000	194,400,000		+194,400,000	
Operation, Air National Guard		192,800,000				−192,800,000	
Maintenance of real property facilities, Air National Guard		1,600,000				−1,600,000	
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, Army	500,000	622,000	622,000	622,000	+122,000		
Operation and maintenance, Alaska Communication System, Army	6,900,000		6,900,000	6,900,000		+6,900,000	
Operation, Alaska Communication System, Army		6,395,000				−6,395,000	
Maintenance of real property facilities, Alaska Communication System, Army		505,000				−505,000	
Salaries and expenses, Secretary of Defense							
Claims, Defense	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000			
Contingencies, Defense	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000			
Salaries and expenses, Court of Military Appeals, Defense	455,000	455,000	455,000	455,000			
Total, title II, operation and maintenance	11,568,800,000	11,551,473,000	11,571,739,000	11,563,889,000	−4,911,000	+12,416,000	−7,850,000

Footnotes at end of tables.

Department of Defense, 1963—Summary of appropriations—Continued

TITLE III—PROCUREMENT

Title	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with— Budget estimate	House	Senate
Procurement of equipment and missiles, Army	$2,555,000,000	$2,500,000,000	$2,555,000,000	$2,520,000,000	−$35,000,000	+$20,000,000	−$35,000,000
Procurement of aircraft and missiles, Navy	[7] 3,065,000,000	[7] 3,007,970,000	[7] 3,057,160,000	[7] 3,034,660,000	−30,340,000	+26,690,000	−22,500,000
Shipbuilding and conversion, Navy	2,982,000,000	[8] 2,907,200,000	[8] 2,929,200,000	[8] 2,919,200,000	−62,800,000	+12,000,000	−10,000,000
Other procurement, Navy	912,000,000	901,700,000	908,500,000	903,600,000	−8,400,000	+1,900,000	−4,900,000
Procurement, Marine Corps	258,000,000	256,000,000	256,000,000	256,000,000	−2,000,000		
Aircraft procurement, Air Force	[9] 3,135,000,000	3,507,900,000	3,604,900,000	3,562,400,000	+427,400,000	+54,500,000	−42,500,000
Missile procurement, Air Force	2,500,000,000	2,459,000,000	2,459,000,000	2,459,000,000	−41,000,000		
Other procurement, Air Force	1,000,000,000	950,000,000	962,500,000	956,250,000	−43,750,000	+6,250,000	−6,250,000
Airlift modernization, Air Force	[10]	[10]	[10]	[10]			
Procurement, Defense agencies	38,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	36,000,000	−2,000,000		
Total, title III, procurement	16,445,000,000	16,525,770,000	16,768,260,000	16,647,110,000	+202,110,000	+121,340,000	−121,150,000

TITLE IV—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Research, development, test, and evaluation, Army	$1,329,000,000	$1,317,000,000	$1,323,000,000	$1,319,500,000	−$9,500,000	+$2,500,000	−$3,500,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy	1,474,000,000	1,473,458,000	1,478,458,000	1,475,958,000	+1,958,000	+2,500,000	−2,500,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force	[11] 3,439,000,000	[11] 3,480,900,000	[11] 3,776,000,000	[11] 3,632,100,000	+193,100,000	+151,200,000	−143,900,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies	451,000,000	439,000,000	449,000,000	444,000,000	−7,000,000	+5,000,000	−5,000,000
Emergency fund, Defense	[12] 150,000,000	[12] 150,000,000	[12] 150,000,000	[12] 150,000,000			
Salaries and expenses, Advanced Research Projects Agency, Department of Defense	[13]	[13]	[13]	[13]			
Total, title IV, research, development, test, and evaluation	6,843,000,000	6,860,358,000	7,176,458,000	7,021,558,000	+178,558,000	+161,200,000	−154,900,000
Total, titles I, II, III, and IV	47,907,000,000	47,839,491,000	48,429,221,000	48,136,247,000	+229,247,000	+296,756,000	−292,974,000

[1] In addition, $350,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[2] In addition, $25,000,000 to be derived by transfer.
[3] In addition, $70,000,000 to be devided by transfer.
[4] Reflects decrease of $6,900,000 in H. Doc. 377.
[5] Includes increase of $6,900,000 in H. Doc. 377.
[6] Language providing $15,000,000 by transfer from Navy stock fund.
[7] In addition, $165,000,000 to be derived by transfer from "Aircraft and related procurement, Navy."
[8] In addition $20,000,000 to be derived by transfer from the Navy industrial fund.
[9] In addition reappropriation of $514,500,000.
[10] Appropriation now combined with "Aircraft procurement, Air Force."
[11] Includes $747,300,000 for activities previously carried under Air Force procurement accounts.
[12] In addition, $150,000,000 to be derived by transfer from other appropriations available for obligation in the respective fiscal year.
[13] Appropriation now combined with "Research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense agencies."

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10802) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see page 13968 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27, 1962.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as this bill passed the Senate it provided for appropriations totaling $922,560,820 for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior, exclusive of the Bureau of Reclamation and power marketing agencies, and the various related agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service.

The conference committee bill provides appropriations totaling $885,362,000 for the programs and activities of these agencies. This total is under the budget estimates of $932,674,000 by $47,312,000; over the House bill of $868,595,000 by $16,767,000; and under the Senate bill of $922,560,820 by $37,198,820.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the senior member of the subcommittee on this side of the aisle, asked to be notified when the conference report on this appropriation bill was taken up. I have had him notified; I do not know whether he desires to come to the Chamber or not. If the Senator would be willing to delay the adoption of the conference report for a few minutes, I will be able to ascertain whether the Senator from South Dakota desires to be present.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me? I should like to ask him a few questions.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

ADDITION TO FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORY WINS APPROVAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. I understand that the committee of conference included a $200,000 appropriation to begin an addition to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis.

Mr. HAYDEN. For the beginning of the construction; yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that was a very wise decision, and I am delighted by it. This project has been strongly favored by the Forest Service for a number of years. The Forest Service believes it is essential if there is to be effective research in forest products. The forest products laboratory has made a magnificent record. Actually, the developments which have flowed from forest products research have been so great that, according to one calculation I have seen, the Federal Government has received in return something like $71 in tax revenues for each $1 spent in research.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question that the laboratory renders valuable service to the Forest Service and to the country as a whole.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am grateful to the Senator from Arizona for standing firmly by the Senate's position and being successful in securing this appropriation of $200,000. It will mean much not only in the field of forest research generally but specifically to the people of Wisconsin, and especially of Madison, where the Forest Products Laboratory is located. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. What action was taken with respect to the implementation of the borrowing authority to continue the helium program, for which, the Senator will recall, the House provided $6 million and the Senate provided $20 million? This is a most important program designed to stop the depletion of a great natural resource which this country will probably be lacking in about 1980, unless something is done to correct the condition.

Mr. HAYDEN. This subject was given publicity by the Washington Star and other newspapers. The reason why the Senate receded—as a matter of fact, offered to recede—is that the Assistant Director of the Bureau of Mines for the Development of Helium Properties, in a memorandum prepared on July 23, 1962, for the Director of the Division of Budget and Finance, Department of the Interior, stated:

> The financial integrity of the program would be reasonably assured if additional borrowing authority in the amount of $6 million should be provided.

Because the Director made this statement after having appealed the $14 million reduction made by the House, the Senate conferees had no ground on which to insist on the Senate figure. The evidence was all the other way.

Mr. ALLOTT. It may be said that the Department of the Interior reversed its ground, much like a halfback on a muddy field.

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly so.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does the Senator from Arizona know of this matter, of which I was informed today, and of which I do not have knowledge of the facts: That the General Accounting Office has raised questions with respect to the contracts which have been let to date under the helium program. One example I heard raised was that the contracts do not contain a renegotiation figure. As I understand, the General Accounting Office plans to submit a report on this question in the fall. Has the Senator heard that?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have heard a rumor to that effect; I know nothing definite about it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very much interested in this subject, having written the helium bill originally. In order that the matter can be cleared up, would the Senator from Arizona be willing to communicate with the General Accounting Office, to see if there can be an acceleration of the report, so that we may clear the decks for this important program and determine exactly where we stand?

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe that that would be entirely proper to do, and I shall be glad to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 10802, which was read as follows:

> IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
> *July 30, 1962.*
>
> *Resolved*, That the House agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10802) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."
>
> *Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert: "Secretary, except that tribal funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims shall not be further appropriated until a report of the purposes for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and those purposes either have been approved by resolution of each of said committees or have not been disapproved by resolution of either of said committees within sixty calendar days from the date the report is submitted, not counting days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain:".

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation setting forth the appropriation for the current year, the budget estimate, the House allowance, the Senate allowance, and the conference allowance for each appropriation in the bill.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year, 1963

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT					
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of lands and resources	[1] $33,750,000	[2] $43,252,000	$39,375,000	$43,022,200	$41,510,200
Construction	850,000	[3] 1,300,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Oregon and California grant lands (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(7,750,000)	(7,750,000)	(7,750,000)	(7,750,000)	(7,750,000)
Range improvements (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(740,000)	(1,045,000)	(1,045,000)	(1,045,000)	(1,045,000)
Total, Bureau of Land Management	34,600,000	[4] 44,552,000	40,375,000	44,022,200	42,510,200
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
Education and welfare services	[5] 71,750,000	82,827,000	81,000,000	82,827,000	81,300,000
Resources management	29,075,000	34,417,000	34,300,000	34,677,000	34,300,000
Revolving fund for loans	[6] 4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Construction	39,561,000	54,765,000	52,000,000	55,550,000	53,775,000
Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	16,000,000	17,000,000	16,000,000	17,000,000	16,000,000
General administrative expenses	3,967,000	4,372,000	4,000,000	4,350,000	4,000,000
Liquidation of Klamath and Menominee Agencies	31,000				
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds	164,384,000	197,381,000	191,300,000	198,404,000	193,375,000
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE					
Management and protection	[7] 21,811,500	27,240,000	25,425,000	26,034,320	25,525,000
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	17,869,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Construction	[8] 36,726,000	44,000,000	40,000,000	44,526,000	40,775,500
Construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	30,000,000	30,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000	29,000,000
General administrative expenses	1,581,000	2,100,000	1,900,000	1,964,000	1,964,000
Total, National Park Service	107,987,500	123,340,000	116,325,000	121,524,320	117,264,500
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES					
Administration of territories	[9] 10,334,000	[10] 15,478,000	13,768,000	13,768,000	13,768,000
Trust Territories of the Pacific Islands	[11] 6,304,000	10,000,000	6,600,000	6,600,000	6,600,000
Alaska public works	([12])				
Total, Office of Territories	16,638,000	25,478,000	20,368,000	20,368,000	20,368,000
Total, Public Land Management	323,609,500	390,751,000	368,368,000	384,318,520	373,517,700

Footnotes at end of tables.

Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year, 1963 — Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
MINERAL RESOURCES					
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
Surveys, investigations, and research	[13] $49,820,000	$59,900,000	$56,100,000	$56,900,000	$56,100,000
BUREAU OF MINES					
Conservation and development of mineral resources	24,800,000	[14] 27,000,000	26,550,000	26,887,000	26,675,000
Health and safety	7,200,000	[14] 8,158,000	8,158,000	8,158,000	8,158,000
Construction	835,000	1,000,000	425,000	425,000	425,000
General administrative expenses	1,290,000	1,333,000	1,333,000	1,333,000	1,333,000
Development and operation of helium properties (borrowing authorization)	(10,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(6,000,000)	(20,000,000)	(6,000,000)
Total, Bureau of Mines	34,125,000	37,491,000	36,466,000	36,803,000	36,591,000
OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH					
Salaries and expenses	1,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	3,450,000	3,450,000
OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION					
Salaries and expenses	750,000	1,000,000	750,000	875,000	750,000
Lead and zinc stabilization program		4,900,000	2,450,000	2,450,000	2,450,000
Total, Office of Minerals Exploration	750,000	5,900,000	3,200,000	3,325,000	3,200,000
OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS					
Salaries and expenses	531,000	[15] 731,000	531,000	531,000	531,000
OFFICE OF MINERALS MOBILIZATION					
Salaries and expenses		[16] 180,000			
Total, mineral resources	86,226,000	106,202,000	98,297,000	101,009,000	99,872,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE					
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Salaries and expenses	364,000	364,000	364,000	364,000	364,000
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES					
Management and investigations of resources	[17] 12,550,000	15,213,000	14,600,000	15,981,500	15,225,000
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program)	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Construction	7,561,000	8,414,000	7,900,000	8,473,000	8,473,000
Construction of fishing vessels	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
General administrative expenses	482,000	616,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Administration of Pribilof Islands (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(1,981,000)	(1,998,000)	(1,998,000)	(1,998,000)	(1,998,000)
Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	21,643,000	25,293,000	24,150,000	26,104,500	25,348,000
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE					
Management and investigations of resources	23,315,650	[18] 26,572,000	26,500,000	27,436,000	27,112,000
Construction	5,257,500	4,086,000	4,900,000	8,033,800	6,922,300
Migratory bird conservation account		7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000
General administrative expenses	1,071,000	1,331,000	1,250,000	1,331,000	1,250,000
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	29,644,150	38,989,000	39,650,000	43,800,800	42,284,300
Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	51,651,150	64,646,000	64,164,000	70,269,300	67,996,300
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER					
Salaries and expenses	[19] 5,255,000	7,700,000	7,600,000	7,700,000	7,600,000
Operation and maintenance		[20] 2,085,000	2,000,000	2,085,000	2,000,000
Construction, operation, and maintenance	4,550,000				
Total, Office of Saline Water	9,805,000	9,785,000	9,600,000	9,785,000	9,600,000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR					
Salaries and expenses	3,492,000	3,747,000	3,600,000	3,747,000	3,675,000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY					
Salaries and expenses	[21] 3,385,000	[22] 3,568,000	3,350,000	3,340,000	3,350,000
Total, definite appropriations	478,168,650	578,699,000	547,379,000	572,468,820	558,011,000
Total, indefinite appropriations of receipts	10,471,000	10,793,000	10,793,000	10,793,000	10,793,000
Total, borrowing authorizations	10,000,000	20,000,000	6,000,000	20,000,000	6,000,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior	498,639,650	609,492,000	564,172,000	603,261,820	574,804,000
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
FOREST SERVICE					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management	128,000,000	140,740,000	138,400,000	141,045,000	139,400,000
Forest research	26,368,000	23,150,000	22,975,000	25,865,000	24,835,000
State and private forestry cooperation	15,800,000	15,800,000	15,800,000	16,405,000	15,830,000
Total, forest protection and utilization	170,168,000	179,690,000	177,175,000	183,315,000	180,065,000
Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)	35,000,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000	37,500,000
Access roads	2,000,000	2,000,000		6,000,000	2,000,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Superior National Forest	250,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Special acts (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)

Footnotes at end of tables.

Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, fiscal year, 1963—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1962 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1963	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Continued					
FOREST SERVICE—continued					
Cooperative range improvements (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	($700,000)	($700,000)	($700,000)	($700,000)	($700,000)
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,500,000	1,000,000
Total, definite appropriations	208,418,000	222,190,000	217,675,000	230,315,000	222,565,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	710,000	710,000	710,000	730,000	730,000
Total, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture	209,128,000	222,900,000	218,385,000	231,045,000	223,295,000
FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW					
Salaries and expenses	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000	70,000
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses	70,000	80,000	70,000	80,000	80,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
Indian health activities	53,010,000	55,834,000	55,284,000	57,000,000	55,834,000
Construction of Indian health activities	8,285,000	9,220,000	8,320,000	9,335,000	9,335,000
Total, Public Health Service	61,295,000	65,054,000	63,604,000	66,335,000	65,169,000
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	280,000	295,000	290,000	290,000	290,000
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	525,000	625,000	625,000	625,000	625,000
Salaries and expenses, open space study, National Capital region		65,000			
Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system	500,000	1,300,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Total, National Capital Planning Commission	1,025,000	1,990,000	725,000	725,000	725,000
NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY					
Salaries and expenses	[23] 960,000	4,450,000	3,350,000	2,825,000	3,000,000
Land acquisition and construction	[24] 1,000,000	2,000,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
Total, National Capital Transportation Agency	1,960,000	6,450,000	3,750,000	3,225,000	3,400,000
OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses	550,000				
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION					
Salaries and expenses	9,125,000	11,354,000	10,900,000	10,900,000	10,900,000
Additions to the Natural History Building	4,336,000				
Remodeling of Civil Service Commission Building	400,000	5,400,000			
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park		950,000	1,275,000	1,275,000	1,275,000
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art	1,932,000	2,054,000	2,054,000	2,054,000	2,054,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	15,793,000	19,758,000	14,229,000	14,229,000	14,229,000
TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA					
Grants	6,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION					
Expenses	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Total, definite appropriations	295,561,000	318,987,000	303,513,000	318,369,000	309,628,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	710,000	710,000	710,000	730,000	730,000
Total, title II, related agencies	296,271,000	319,697,000	304,223,000	319,099,000	310,358,000
TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION					
Contributions	[25]	185,000			
Revolving fund	881,000	3,300,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Limitation of administrative expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation	(180,000)	(200,000)	(180,000)	(180,000)	(180,000)
Total, title III, Virgin Islands Corporation	881,000	3,485,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Grand total:					
Definite appropriations	774,610,650	901,171,000	851,092,000	891,037,820	868,839,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	11,181,000	11,503,000	11,503,000	11,523,000	11,523,000
Borrowing authorizations	10,000,000	20,000,000	6,000,000	20,000,000	6,000,000
Total	795,791,650	932,674,000	868,595,000	922,560,820	885,362,000

[1] Includes $1,250,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[2] Includes $1,700,000 in S. Doc. 88.
[3] Includes $300,000 in S. Doc. 88.
[4] Includes $2,000,000 in S. Doc.88.
[5] Includes $750,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[6] Appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[7] Includes $25,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[8] Includes $2,250,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[9] Includes $4,500,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[10] Includes budget amendment of $2,579,000 for American Samoa in H. Doc. No. 334.
[11] Includes $200,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[12] Act continues available $108,000 of prior appropriations.
[13] Includes $100,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[14] Reflects transfer in the estimates of $267,000 from "Conservation and development of mineral resources" to "Health and safety."
[15] Includes $200,000 for activities previously carried under "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies," Office of Emergency Planning.
[16] Amount previously carried under "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies," Office of Emergency Planning.
[17] Includes $400,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[18] Includes $35,000 for an activity previously carried under "Grain for migratory waterfowl."
[19] Includes $3,500,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[20] For activities previously carried under "Construction, operation, and maintenance, Office of Saline Water."
[21] Includes $200,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[22] Includes $106,500 for activities previously carried under "Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies," Office of Emergency Planning.
[23] Includes $85,000 appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[24] Appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1962.
[25] Appropriation language provides for a grant to the Corporation of $669,000 to be derived by transfer from internal revenue collections appropriated to the Virgin Islands government.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1748, H.R. 11151, and that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11151) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to inquire of the distinguished majority leader what the program will be for the rest of the day and tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No action will be taken on the legislative appropriation bill tonight; it will be the pending business.

It is hoped that when the Senate finishes with this measure tomorrow, it will be possible to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1494, H.R. 7913, to amend title 10, United States Code, to bring the number of cadets at the U.S. Military Academy and the U.S. Air Force Academy up to full strength; and possibly Calendar No. 1590, S. 1108, authorizing the conveyance of certain property in the city of San Diego to the regents of the University of California.

I hope also that at the appropriate time the 12 bills, reported from the Commerce Committee, having to do with the merchant marine will be considered.

I announce to the Senate, with the concurrence of the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], that on Monday the Senate will take up Calendar No. 1701, Senate bill 284, the Fryingpan authorization bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished majority leader that we shall be happy to have that bill taken up on Monday, and I appreciate very much the Senator's consideration.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW, AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NO. 1 ROADBLOCK TO ECONOMY: THE FAT SACRED COWS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senate acted on the largest peacetime appropriation in the history of our Nation, and one of the largest appropriations the country has ever made either in peacetime or in wartime—the $48 billion defense appropriation bill. If we add to it the $1.3 billion included in the military construction bill and the $3.7 billion in the space authorization bill, we find that $53 billion of appropriations are involved in the three bills.

If we also recognize that we have no control whatsoever over approximately $10 billion which must be used to service the national debt—for the Congress has no possible ability to reduce that amount, inasmuch as the interest on the national debt must be paid in any event—and if we likewise recognize that, in addition, there are billions of dollars in contractual obligations to veterans, it should become apparent that the action taken today by the Senate, together with action which is almost sure to be taken in the near future, involves approximately three-fourths of all the spending under the control of Congress.

I call this situation to the attention of the Senate at this late hour because I feel very strongly that, unfortunately, Congress has permitted the greatest areas of expenditures to become "sacred cows," and has refused to consider the possibility of making substantial reductions in spending in these areas.

DEFENSE SPENDING SHOULD BE SCRUTINIZED, TOO

Like all other Senators, I feel that we must have a fully adequate Defense Establishment, and I recognize its great cost. But I also feel that we are not fulfilling our responsibilities if we do not question the amount of spending in this area, where the spending is the greatest, and if we do not consider alternative possibilities which would enable us to reduce this amount of spending.

Mr. President, earlier today the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], our majority whip, raised what has become almost a lone voice in the Congress when he spoke in favor of our being aggressively insistent on trying to achieve a treaty as the first step toward arms control and arms limitation. Anyone who really believes that we should cut back spending in our Government must recognize that reduced spending must begin here. Unless we can achieve realistic arms limitation, and thus begin to put under control and limit the immense increase in spending that has occurred year after year in the defense area, there will be no possibility of any significant reduction in taxes, and this immense burden on the American people will continue ad infinitum.

A little later in my remarks I shall comment on the suggestions which have been made in regard to the proposed tax cut. I shall discuss that situation in connection with the action the Senate has taken today, because many Members of the Senate who are advocating a tax cut are also insisting that we must continue to spend $90 or $95 billion a year; and in advocating a tax cut at a time when we are greatly increasing our spending, they are advocating an increased deficit and an increased national debt.

MAN-TO-MOON SPENDING SOAKS UP SCIENTISTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, first, I wish to call attention to the fact that about 4½ hours ago, when the Senate agreed to the NASA authorization conference report, that action in effect increased the authorization for research in space—because almost all of that money is used for that purpose—from $1.7 billion to $3.7 billion, an increase of more than $2,000 million, or $2 billion. This is by far the largest percentage increase which any agency of our Government is likely to receive this year, and this increase is not in a defense program. The space research, space construction, and space spending which pertain to our defense are included in our Defense budget—in the bill the Senate acted on a few minutes ago. But this $3.7 billion item is related almost entirely to our man-to-the-moon project. A large amount of Federal funds for research is also included in the Defense bill the Senate passed. However, as I have said, a huge part of the $3.7 billion in the space budget is for research and development.

This morning one of the Nation's outstanding columnists, James Reston, wrote an article from which I wish to quote. The article, which was published in the New York Times, comments on this situation as follows:

> For example, Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, President Kennedy's Director of the Office of Science and Technology, told the Congress today that the U.S. Government will put more money into research and development this fiscal year than it spent "in the entire interval from the American Revolution through and including World War II."

Mr. Reston proceeds to point out the profound economic and scientific impact involved in this spending; but he wisely also indicates something which I discussed on the floor of the Senate when the NASA authorization bill was before us for amendment. He writes:

THE IMPONDERABLES

> Meanwhile, Dr. Wiesner is worried about a number of important related questions. The Government is responsible for these research and development programs but is having trouble keeping enough competent scientists in Government service to do the job. How can the Government compete with the much larger financial rewards being made available in nonprofit organizations like the Rand Corp., Aerospace, and others? How are scientists working part time for the Government as consultants and part time for private industry on Government contracts to avoid violating the conflict-of-interest laws?
>
> Yet even these difficult questions only begin to touch on the much broader imponderables raised by these vast expenditures of money. So much money is available for applied science contracts that some educators are afraid basic research is being shortchanged, and that science in general is beginning to overwhelm the humanities in many universities.
>
> Again, there is such a scurry in the developing field of military technology that other nonmilitary scientific fields such as metallurgy and oceanography may not be developed as much as they could.
>
> For example, is the emphasis on military technology the best way to use science to increase the economic growth of the Nation? The experts differ on this. In fact, they differ on almost all the questions raised here,

Public Law 87-578
87th Congress, H. R. 10802
August 9, 1962

An Act

76 STAT. 335

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, namely:

Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Bureau of Land Management

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, $41,510,200.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction of access roads, acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads (other than on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands), and acquisition and construction of buildings and appurtenant facilities, $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such lands; an amount equivalent to 25 per centum of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for the purposes of this appropriation on lands administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction on lands other than those administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated herein is hereby made a reimbursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876). 43 USC 1181f.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase of nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft; purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures; and alteration and maintenance of necessary

buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Provided*, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands (other than expenditures made under the appropriation "Oregon and California grant lands") shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in subsection (c), title II, of the
43 USC 1181f. Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876), of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California land-grant fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 754), of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund": *Provided further*, That appropriations herein made may be expended on a reimbursable basis for (1) surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and (2) protection and leasing of lands and mineral resources for the State of Alaska.

RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the Act of June 28,
48 Stat. 1270. 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all
43 USC 315b, 315i. moneys received, during the current fiscal year, as range improvement fees under section 3 of said Act, 25 per centum of all moneys received
43 USC 315m. during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of said Act, and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior
3 CFR 1954-1958 Comp., p. 424. by Executive Order 10787, dated November 6, 1958, to remain available until expended.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

For expenses necessary to provide education and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission), of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; $81,300,000.

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian arts and crafts as authorized by law; $34,300,000.

REVOLVING FUND FOR LOANS

For payment to the revolving fund for loans, as authorized by section 10 of the Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (25 U.S.C. 470),
48 Stat. 986. $4,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; $53,775,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations. Restrictions.

ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, and the Act of August 23, 1958 (72 Stat. 834), $16,000,000, to remain available until expended. 25 USC 631 and note.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices, $4,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for expenses of exhibits; purchase of not to exceed two hundred and twenty passenger motor vehicles (including fifty for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year), of which two hundred shall be for replacement only, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; advance payments for service (including services which may extend beyond the current fiscal year) under contracts executed pursuant to the Act of June 4, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 452), the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), and legislation terminating Federal supervision over certain Indian tribes; purchase of ice for official use of employees; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions. 49 Stat. 1458. 25 USC 309, 309a.

TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated $3,000,000 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition, and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission); purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel, and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27,

1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a curator for the Osage Museum, who shall be appointed with the approval of the Osage Tribal Council and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary, except that tribal funds derived from appropriations in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims shall not be further appropriated until a report of the purposes for which the funds are to be used has been submitted to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and those purposes either have been approved by resolution of each of said committees or have not been disapproved by resolution of either of said committees within sixty calendar days from the date the report is submitted, not counting days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three calendar days to a day certain: *Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation or other tribal funds shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, if such acquisition results in the property being exempted from local taxation, except as provided for by the Act of July 2[illegible] 1956 (70 Stat. 627).

Report to Congressional committees.

Restriction.

National Park Service

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For expenses necessary for the management and protection of the areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service, including protection of lands in process of condemnation; and for plans, investigations, and studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail plans and working drawings) and archeological values in river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin); $25,525,000.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service, $20,000,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451), of buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, including the White House; the repair or replacement of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, or storm, or the construction of projects deferred by reason of the use of funds for such purposes; the acquisition of water rights; and not to exceed $8,622,000 for the acquisition of lands, interest therein, improvements, and related personal property; $40,775,500, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the condemnation of any land for Grand Teton National Park in the State of Wyoming.

37 Stat. 460; 54 Stat. 36.

Restriction.

CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, $29,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein provided shall be expended for planning or construction on the following: Fort Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, except minor roads and trails; Great Falls Park, Virginia; Daingerfield Island Marina, Virginia; and extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the National Park Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, $1,964,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and fifty-two passenger motor vehicles (of which one hundred and twenty-five are for replacement only), including not to exceed fifty-seven for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and the objects and purposes specified in the Acts of August 8, 1953 (16 U.S.C. 1b–1d), and July 1, 1955 (16 U.S.C. 18f). 67 Stat. 495; 69 Stat. 242.

Office of Territories

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and for the departmental administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C., secs. 1422, 1431a(c)); 64 Stat. 386. salaries of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secretary, the Government Comptroller, and the members of their immediate staffs as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1591, 72 Stat. 1095); compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. secs. 1421d(e), 1431a(c), and 1572e); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1431a(c)); grants to American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the houses of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa; $13,768,000: *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments herein provided for are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of Territories may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary. 68 Stat. 503. 48 USC 1641. 64 Stat. 391; 45 Stat. 1253; 73 Stat. 568.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

For expenses necessary for the Department of the Interior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by joint resolution of July 18, 1947 (61 Stat. 397), and the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), in- 22 USC 287 note. 48 USC 1681 and note.

cluding the expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and expenses of the Judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of governmental functions; $6,600,000: *Provided*, That the revolving fund for loans to locally owned private trading enterprises shall continue to be available during the fiscal year 1963: *Provided further*, That all financial transactions of the Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 834): *Provided further*, That the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of article 6(2) of the Trusteeship Agreement approved by Congress: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any law, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to receive, during the current fiscal year, from the Department of Agriculture for distribution on the same basis as domestic distribution in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, without exchange of funds, such surplus food commodities as may be available pursuant to section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 612c) and section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1431).

31 USC 1.
31 USC 65 note.
61 Stat. 3302.
49 Stat. 774.
68 Stat. 458; 73 Stat. 250.

Alaska Railroad

ALASKA RAILROAD REVOLVING FUND

The Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall continue available until expended for the work authorized by law, including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit and development of industries or travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916 (5 U.S.C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided: *Provided*, That no employee shall be paid an annual salary out of said fund in excess of the salaries prescribed by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS–15, except the general manager of said railroad, one assistant general manager at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for GS–17, and five officers at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for grade GS–16.

39 Stat. 750.
74 Stat. 298.
5 USC 1113.

MINERAL RESOURCES

Geological Survey

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by law (72 Stat. 837);

5 USC 485 note.

classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; control the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U.S.C. 715); and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; $56,100,000, of which $8,430,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State or municipality. 49 Stat. 30.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed forty-nine passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; purchase of not to exceed one aircraft for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations and observation wells; expenses of U.S. National Committee on Geology and payment of contributions to the International Union on Geologic Sciences; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts.

Bureau of Mines

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; and developing synthetics and substitutes; $26,675,000.

HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries, and controlling fires in coal deposits, as authorized by law, $8,158,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For the construction and improvement of facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Mines, $425,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines, including such expenses in the regional offices, $1,333,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed sixty-seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; providing transportation services in isolated areas for employees, student dependents of employees, and other pupils, and such activities may be financed under cooperative arrangements; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF HELIUM PROPERTIES

The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treasury for payment to the helium production fund pursuant to section 12(a) of the
74 Stat. 923. Helium Act Amendments of 1960 to carry out the provisions of the
50 USC 167j. Act and contractual obligations thereunder, including helium purchases, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, $6,000,000, in addition to amounts heretofore authorized to be borrowed.

Office of Coal Research

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and
30 USC 668. development, as authorized by law (74 Stat. 337), $3,450,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $300,000 shall be available for administration and supervision.

Office of Minerals Exploration

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to provide a program for the discovery of the minerals reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions, by encouraging exploration for minerals, including administration of contracts entered into prior to June 30, 1958, under section 303
65 Stat. 133. of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, $750,000, includ-
50 USC app.2093. ing not to exceed $213,600 for administrative and technical services, to remain available until expended.

LEAD AND ZINC STABILIZATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out a lead and zinc mining stabilization program, including payments to producers, as authorized by the
30 USC 681. Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766), $2,450,000.

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities with respect to oil and gas, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and its products, and natural gas, $531,000.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Commissioner, $364,000.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such resources; promotion of education and training of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions related thereto, as authorized by law; $15,225,000.

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

(SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(k) of that Act, $300,000, which shall be available to purchase only those currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States. 72 Stat. 275.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required for the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, $8,473,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960, Public Law 86–516, to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, $750,000. 74 Stat. 212. 46 USC 1401-1413.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, including such expenses in the regional offices, $600,000.

87871 O-62-2

ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a–631q), there are appropriated amounts not to exceed $1,998,000, to be derived from Pribilof Islands fund.

58 Stat. 100.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FISHERIES LOAN FUND

During the current fiscal year not to exceed $250,000 of the Fisheries loan fund shall be available for administrative expenses.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife

MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; purchase or rent of land, and functions related to wildlife management in California (16 U.S.C. 695–695c); and leasing and management of lands for the protection of the Florida Key deer; $27,112,000.

62 Stat. 238.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, $6,922,300, to remain available until expended.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

For an advance to the Migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), $7,000,000, to remain available until expended.

16 USC 715k-3.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, including such expenses in the regional offices, $1,250,000.

Administrative Provisions

Appropriations and funds available to the Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred and twenty-four passenger motor vehicles of which ninety-two shall be for replacement only (including fifty for police-type use which may exceed by $300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year); purchase of not to exceed two aircraft; not to exceed $30,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Fish and Wildlife Service; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417); rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed $3 per man per day; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Fish and Wildlife Serv-

34 Stat. 690.

ice; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed $1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Fish and Wildlife Service and to which the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

Office of Saline Water

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951–1958), authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, to remain available until expended, $7,600,000, of which not to exceed $525,000 shall be available for administration and coordination during the current fiscal year. 75 Stat. 628.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of demonstration plants for the production of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, as authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958a–1958g), $2,000,000, of which not to exceed $175,000 shall be available for administration. 72 Stat. 1706.

Office of the Solicitor

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, $3,675,000, and in addition, not to exceed $130,000 may be reimbursed or transferred to this appropriation from other accounts available to the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That hearing officers appointed for Indian probate work need not be appointed pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), as amended. 5 USC 1001 note.

Office of the Secretary

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior (referred to herein as the Secretary), including teletype rentals and service, not to exceed $2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, and purchase of one passenger motor vehicle (medium sedan at not to exceed $3,000) for replacement only, $3,350,000.

General Provisions, Department of the Interior

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted. Emergency reconstruction.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest Forest or range fires.

or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft or other equipment in connection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof.

Operation of warehouses, etc.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686): *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

47 Stat. 417.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title or in the Public Works Appropriations Act, 1963 shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), when authorized by the Secretary, at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals, and in total amount not to exceed $175,000; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

60 Stat. 810.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131 and D.C. Code 4–204).

68 Stat. 1114; 43 Stat. 175.

TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For expenses necessary for forest protection and utilization, as follows:

Forest land management: For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, including the administration and improvement, development, and management of lands under Forest Service administration, fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening such lands and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purposes, control of white pine blister rust and other forest diseases and insects on Federal and non-Federal lands; $139,400,000, of which $5,000,000 for fighting and preventing forest fires and $1,910,000 for insect and disease control shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to the extent necessary under the then existing conditions: *Provided*, That not more than $500,000 may be used for acquisition of land under the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513–519): *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for "Cooperative range improvements", pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), may be advanced to this appropriation.

31 USC 665.

36 Stat. 962.

64 Stat. 85.

Forest research: For forest research at forest and range experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, as authorized by law; $24,835,000.

State and private forestry cooperation: For cooperation with States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in forest tree planting on non-Federal public and private lands, and in forest management and processing, and for advising timberland owners, associations, wood-using industries, and others in the application of forest management principles and processing of forest products, as authorized by law; $15,830,000.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, sections 203 and 205, relating to the construction and maintenance of forest development roads and trails, $37,500,000, to remain available until expended, for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203: *Provided*, That funds available under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), shall be merged with and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That not less than the amount made available under the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913, shall be expended under the provisions of such Act. 37 Stat. 843.

ACCESS ROADS

For additional roads needed for access to national forest lands in carrying out the Act of June 4, 1897, as amended (16 U.S.C. 471, 472, 475, 476, 551), $2,000,000. 26 Stat. 1103; 33 Stat. 628; 30 Stat. 34.

ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

For completion of the acquisition of forest land within the Superior National Forest, Minnesota, under the provisions of the Act of June 22, 1948 (62 Stat. 570; 16 U.S.C. 577c–h), as amended, by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, $2,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be available without regard to the restriction in the proviso in section 1 of that Act.

SPECIAL ACTS

For the acquisition of land in the Cache National Forest, Utah, in accordance with the Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), as amended, $10,000, to be derived from forest receipts as authorized by said Act: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned. 58 Stat. 227.

For acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), as amended, authorizing annual appropriation of forest receipts for such purposes, from such receipts, $20,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of the national forest.

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests in accordance with section 12 of the
64 Stat. 85. Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), to be derived from grazing fees as authorized by said section, $700,000, to remain available until expended.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the Agricultural
70 Stat. 207. Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16 U.S.C. 568e), $1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Passenger motor vehicles. Appropriations available to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to exceed one hundred and sixty-five passenger motor vehicles, of which one hundred and thirty-seven shall be for replacement only, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed three of which one shall be for replacement only; (b) employ-
58 Stat. 742. ment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of
60 Stat. 810. August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not to exceed $25,000; (c) uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of
68 Stat. 1114. September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); (d) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (5
58 Stat. 742. U.S.C. 565a); (e) expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16
36 Stat. 963. U.S.C. 514); and (f) acquisition of land and interests therein for sites for administrative purposes, pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956
70 Stat. 1034. (7 U.S.C. 428a).

Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

Funds appropriated under this Act shall not be used for acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911,
36 Stat. 962. as amended (16 U.S.C. 513–519, 521), where such land is not within the boundaries of a national forest nor shall these lands or lands authorized for purchase in Sanders County, Montana, be acquired without approval of the local government concerned.

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
60 Stat. 810. August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $70,000.

Commission of Fine Arts

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission
36 Stat. 371. of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), including payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and Committee meetings of the Commission either within

or outside the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the Commission, $80,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), as amended; purchase of not to exceed twenty-six passenger motor vehicles, of which nineteen shall be for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the purposes set forth in sections 301 (with respect to research conducted at facilities financed by this appropriation), 321, 322(d), 324, and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; $55,834,000.

42 USC 2001 et seq.

58 Stat. 691.
42 USC 241, 248, 249, 251, 227.

CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable buildings; purchase of trailers; and provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a); $9,335,000, to remain available until expended.

73 Stat. 267.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

60 Stat. 810.

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for payment in advance for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public and for payment in advance for publications available only upon that basis or available at a reduced price on prepublication orders.

Library membership.

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

68 Stat. 1114.

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities.

Attendance at meetings.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U.S.C. 70), creating an Indian Claims Commission, $290,000, of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available for expenses of travel.

60 Stat. 1049.

National Capital Planning Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71–71i), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $625,000.

66 Stat. 781; D. C. Code 1-1001 note. 60 Stat. 810. 68 Stat. 1114.

LAND ACQUISITION, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK, PARKWAY, AND PLAYGROUND SYSTEM

For necessary expenses for the National Capital Planning Commission for acquisition of land for the park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital, as authorized by the Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 482), as amended, to remain available until expended, $100,000 which shall be available for the purpose of section 1(a) thereof: *Provided*, That not exceeding $50,000 of the funds available for land acquisition purposes shall be used during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses of the Commission (other than payments for land) in connection with land acquisition.

National Capital Transportation Agency

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title II of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537), including payment in advance for membership in societies whose publications or services are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); $3,000,000.

40 USC 661-665. 68 Stat. 1114.

LAND ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for the National Capital Transportation Agency for acquisition of land for extra-wide median strips, or interests therein, and for incidental construction, for transit facilities, as authorized by law, $400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such land purchases shall be subject to the advance approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Smithsonian Institution

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches among the American Indians and the natives of lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United States, independently or in cooperation with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States, and the excavation and preservation of archeological remains; for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; for the administration, construction, and maintenance of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, Canal Zone, under the provisions of the Act of

July 2, 1940, as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan Numbered 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and administration of a national air museum as authorized by the Act of August 12, 1946 (20 U.S.C. 77); for expenses of the National Armed Forces Museum Advisory Board; including not to exceed $35,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), for other employees; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications; $10,900,000.

54 Stat. 724.
20 USC 79-79e.
60 Stat. 1097.
5 USC 133y-16 note.
60 Stat. 997.
60 Stat. 810.
68 Stat. 1114.

CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

For necessary expenses of planning, construction, remodeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the National Zoological Park, $1,275,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such portion of this amount as may be necessary may be transferred to the District of Columbia (20 U.S.C. 81–84; 75 Stat. 779).

26 Stat. 78.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

For the upkeep and operation of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators and uniforms, or allowances therefor for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and not to exceed $15,000 for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper; $2,054,000.

20 USC 71.
53 Stat. 577.
60 Stat. 810.
68 Stat. 1114.

TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA

For grants to the State of Alaska to assist in accomplishing an orderly transition from Territorial status to statehood and to facilitate the assumption of responsibilities hitherto performed in Alaska by the Federal Government, and for expenses of providing Federal services or facilities in Alaska for an interim period, as authorized by law (73 Stat. 151), $3,000,000.

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), as amended (72 Stat. 1769), $100,000.

36 USC 749.

The per diem rate, unless an agency is otherwise limited by law to payment of a lesser per diem, paid from appropriations made available under this title for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), shall not exceed $75.

60 Stat. 810.

TITLE III—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Revolving Fund

For an additional amount for the revolving fund established under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, for advances to the Virgin Islands Corporation, as authorized by law (63 Stat. 350; 72 Stat. 1760), $200,000.

63 Stat. 875.

48 USC 1407 note, 1407e.

Limitation on Administrative Expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation

During the current fiscal year the Virgin Islands Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to it and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal-year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its programs as set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That not to exceed $180,000 shall be available for administrative expenses (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the Corporation, covering the categories set forth in the 1963 budget estimates for such expenses.

61 Stat. 584.

31 USC 849.

Short title.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1963."

Approved August 9, 1962.

○